

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1877.

The Week.

CONGRESS has accomplished little during the week. The Senate has spent considerable time over the claims to seats of Messrs. Kellogg, Spofford, and Eustis, of Louisiana. Spofford was elected by the Nicholls Legislature after the settlement. The Committee on Elections is now hearing evidence in his case and Kellogg's. Some of those who uphold the President's course with regard to Louisiana are said to believe that Kellogg has the best legal claim to a seat, and, in spite of the fact that he represents nothing but the Federal machine in New Orleans, the State may be obliged to put up with him. Mr. Stanley Matthews has introduced a bill for the distribution of the remainder of the Geneva award, providing for a revival of the Court of Commissioners of *Alabama Claims*, and making it their duty to examine all claims presented for damages done by any Confederate cruiser. A bill for the remonetization of silver has been introduced by Senator Jones. The House, which has been in session but a portion of the time, has done nothing but listen to argument in the Colorado case. Bills for the repeal of the Resumption Act and for the payment of half the customs-duties in legal-tender have made their appearance. Mr. Randall has not yet appointed his committees; and the President has as yet sent in for confirmation to the Senate only a portion of the appointments made prior to the meeting of Congress. He has, however, nominated General John M. Harlan, of Kentucky, for the vacancy on the Supreme Court bench; a selection which, while respectable, we suppose would not have occurred to him if he had been bent solely on maintaining the character of the court.

The New York *Times* suggests, and other papers concur, that the Senate ought for its own credit to take up Patterson's case. This man has been indicted in South Carolina for an infamous offence, but shelters himself against extradition by pleading his Senatorial privilege, which protects him against arrest except for treason, felony, or breach of the peace, and refuses to surrender himself for trial. The proofs against him are, we believe, clear, which doubtless accounts for his unwillingness to plead, and the Senate ought in common decency to examine them, and, if found sufficient, expel him, and let the police get a fair chance at him. He is almost the last of the criminal carpet-baggers left in high office, and at least "one penitentiary"—as the politicians say—"is yawning for him."

A "recent assemblage of our fellow-citizens," composed of Senators and Representatives, was held in Washington on Friday, at Secretary Sherman's, of which an outline report has been telegraphed to the press. There were nineteen present, including Mr. Sherman, and the principal object of the gathering was to determine what course the party should adopt in the House, in case the Democrats should carry out a wicked design which they are said to entertain of introducing a resolution in the House approving of the President's "policy." No decision was reached; but only two of those present, Mr. J. D. Cox and Mr. Crape, declared their intention of voting for it. The others seemed to waver between "sitting silent" and voting solidly against it. Only two approved of the civil-service order and the Southern "policy." Most of them seemed to feel very sore, and to be disposed to keep away from the President. Some attached most importance to the "policy," others to the civil-service order, others to the introduction of a Democrat into the Cabinet. Most of them appeared to feel that the President had "gone back on them." They are evidently not much affected by the argument that he is carrying out the Cincinnati plat-

form, for it probably has never occurred to them that platforms were intended to be carried out. The persons present were Hale and Frye, of Maine; Butler and Crape, of Massachusetts; Blair, of New Hampshire; Hendee, of Vermont; Townsend, of New York; Errett, of Pennsylvania; Foster, Garfield, Cox, and Danford, of Ohio; Conger, of Michigan; Burchard and Cannon, of Illinois; Dunnell, of Minnesota; Price, of Iowa; Page, of California, and Thornburgh, of Tennessee. The President has evidently reached the parting of the ways, and must now either fight or surrender, at the same point at which Grant surrendered.

Most of the reports from Washington reveal the existence of considerable dependency among the Republican managers. Even those who are disposed to submit to "the policy" doubt whether the party can be kept up without the aid of the postmasters. The postmasters, they say, are sulky, and won't "work," so the great party is on its last legs. Who would have supposed when listening during these recent years to the accounts of the grand mission of the party, and of its splendid record and its noble composition—"the intelligence and morality of the North"—that it was all postmasters after all? that if the postmasters lost interest in it, or a few thousand poor clerks failed to contribute to its funds from their scanty salaries, this glorious organization would go to pieces, and let freedom and humanity and the American Union shift for themselves? And yet this, if we are to believe "the practical man," is exactly what is impending. Who ever dreamed, when the Government first undertook the carriage of letters, that the postmasters would come to play this proud rôle in the political history of the Anglo-Saxon race; that they would hold the destinies of great parties and great peoples in their hands, and that they would pass in an hour from the humble duty of sorting letters and selling stamps to the task of making and unmaking governments, of taking power from one statesman and giving it to another, and that an appeal would lie to them from the President of the United States as to his manner of exercising his constitutional discretion? It is to be observed that even in this extremity no Republican member of Congress, or set of members of Congress, offers the country any programme or policy on any pressing question of the day—any plan of civil-service reform, except Conkling's burlesque; any scheme of legislation with regard to the tariff, or the currency, or anything else. The one thing they propose is to "stand guard" over the offices, and curse anybody who meddles with them.

Mr. "Zach" Chandler has issued from his retirement in Michigan, in the character of a "practical man," to furnish a plan of civil-service reform. He says the great trouble with all "civil-service advisers" is that they are not competent to carry on large business enterprises. "That great apostle of civil-service reform," for instance, "Mr. George William Curtis, although he can write good editorials, if put in charge of Harper's publishing house would bankrupt it in a year." From which Mr. Chandler apparently deduces the conclusion that we need not pay any attention to what Mr. Curtis says about civil-service reform. Here is Mr. Chandler's own plan:

"There were no patent, strictly-defined rules for civil service. What did men do in the management of their own business? If they found an incompetent man, they discharged him and put a competent man in his place; if they found a lazy man, they discharged him and put an industrious man in his place; if they found a dishonest man, they discharged him and put an honest man in his place; and when they found a good man, when they had a competent man, in their employ, they promoted him, whether he was in a Government office or on a farm."

After giving all due attention to this, we are bound to say that we do not see wherein it differs from Mr. Conkling's great plan produced at the Rochester Convention. Mr. Conk-

ling's Third Rule contains all Mr. Chandler's ideas, and far more tersely expressed: "Fit men and no others should hold public trusts." Add to this Conkling's Fourth Rule: "Every official, high and low, should be required at all times faithfully to perform his duty and the whole of it"; not four-fifths, or six-sevenths, mark you, but "the whole of it." What more than this can Chandler or any man say? Does not this cover everything? It is our painful duty to point out to "Zach," however, that the difficulty about civil-service reform is not in discovering the right principle of administration, but in getting him and his kind to stick to it. He knows perfectly well that even he would "bankrupt the Harpers" in a single year if he conducted their business as the Bureau of Engraving was conducted, with 958 persons doing the work now done by 419, and a shelf for supernumeraries to sleep on during office hours, and if a dozen Congressmen had the right to quarter their dependents on the treasury of the firm. The reason why the Chandler tribe have not long ago bankrupted the United States is that the tax-payers are enormously wealthy and fill up the deficits they make. He does not seriously suppose that the Harpers would permit the ablest of them to carry on their business as the New York Custom-house has been carried on.

General Grant's recent charge of untruthfulness against the late Mr. Sumner in the matter of the accumulation of treaties before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, owing to Mr. Sumner's remissness, and to which he called Mr. G. W. Curtis to witness, has been the cause of amusing discussion during the week. Mr. Wendell Phillips took it up in a lyceum lecture near Boston, and made General Grant wait on Mr. Sumner at his house to ask his support for the San Domingo Treaty, and Mr. Sumner promised it if he found the treaty satisfactory, but on examining the treaty discovered in it "dark treachery to the colored race." Next day he went to see Grant at the White House, and pointed out the reason why he could not support the treaty; Grant listened in "sullen silence," and a friend who was with Mr. Sumner explained that he (the President) had not understood because he was drunk. Moreover, Mr. Fish urged Mr. Sumner to go to London as Minister and press his views on the *Alabama* case, and then basely dismissed Mr. Motley for urging the same views.

How much of this Mr. Phillips heard from some one, and how much he put in himself, it is, of course, impossible to say. It is only worthy of notice because it has drawn a statement from Mr. Fish, which is this: The story that General Grant took the treaty to Mr. Sumner is "a ridiculous falsehood"; it never left the State Department. Its contents were communicated to him really at the White House, and it had his warm approval until he found out that J. M. Ashley, of Ohio, a protégé of his, was not to be one of the San Domingo Commissioners, when he became violently opposed to it. He acknowledges having incautiously suggested the English mission to Mr. Sumner on his complaining to him one day of his great domestic unhappiness, but, seeing how eagerly his suggestion was received, backed out of it and substituted a proposal that he should go to England as a private person, put up with the Duke of Argyll, and plunge into literary labors. He confirms the story of the accumulation of undespached business in Mr. Sumner's hands, which Phillips denied on the *à priori* ground that he knew Sumner to be a methodical and industrious man. The whole affair is one of those belonging to a period when people believed through their sympathies, and it will probably be disposed of in the same way now. Those who like Grant and do not like Mr. Sumner will believe to their dying day that Mr. Sumner had from eight to eleven treaties in his hands for two years, and lied about them afterwards. Mr. Sumner's admirers, on the other hand, will hold to the conviction that the whole thing was pretty much as Phillips described it, and that Sumner detected Grant in "dark treachery to the colored race," Grant being at the time stupidly drunk. The younger gene-

ration, we fear, will simply laugh. The *Evening Post*, which is not generally a humorous paper, asks why Phillips supported Grant as a candidate for re-election if he knew him to be drunk when a treaty was being explained to him. The answer probably is that he did not know that Grant was drunk on that occasion until he (Phillips) began to lecture at Newton. Some of his most telling facts often come to him in this way on the platform after he begins to speak.

A meeting called for the purpose of awakening public attention to the vital importance of ensuring the success of the constitutional amendments proposed by Governor Tilden's Municipal Commission, was held at Steinway Hall on Monday evening. The call was signed by many of our best-known and wealthiest and most respected citizens, who, as well as the speakers at the meeting, represented about equally the two political parties. An ineffectual organized attempt to break up the meeting was made by a small mob of Communists headed by Justus Schwab, a leader of the crowd which gathered at Tompkins Square at the time of the railroad riots. The amendments have been passed by one legislature, but must be passed by the next one before they can be submitted for final adoption or rejection to the people of the State. But this is precisely what Communists and "bosses" mean to prevent if they can. Good management made the effort to capture the Steinway Hall meeting a ridiculous failure, but the character of the mob lends all needed emphasis to the movement which it sought to check. The speeches of Messrs. Robinson, Stone, Sterne, and others were excellent, as were the resolutions to which they referred, and the meeting appointed a committee of fifty to unite all persons, irrespective of party, at the coming election in favor of such candidates for the legislature as will vote to submit the amendments to the people. Upon this committee will probably depend the success or failure, for a long time to come, of the most important measure of municipal reform proposed by the present generation.

Most thinking and humane persons will agree with us in saying that the editors of the great newspapers would do a manly and generous and becoming thing in calling their reporters off from the unfortunate wife and children of William C. Gilman; and that the Rev. H. W. Beecher would do well to have no more "talks" about them either with his congregation or with the collectors of "city items." Gilman is undergoing his sentence. His case, so far as the public is concerned, is closed. Newspaper pursuit of his family into their retirement can only gratify a morbid and, indeed, brutal curiosity, and is injurious and cruel to them. We trust that decent people will hereafter discountenance it. We shall all understand, without learning it through the reporters, that the case "is like the shadow of a funeral upon all that Mr. Beecher says and does," and we know, without the evidence of the Gilman case, that, as Mr. Beecher remarks, "any one who sups with the devil must have a long spoon."

In Wall Street there has been a collapse of the "bull speculation" in stocks, which has been carried on with little interruption during the last six months by the united capital and skill of all the large professional speculators and a leading railroad capitalist not previously identified with Wall Street speculation pure and simple. The failure of the public to buy stocks made it necessary for such of this party as wished to sell to do so secretly, and to "unload" on their associates. This was done, and as soon as it was discovered a general stampede began, which resulted in driving the prices of the leading stocks down from five to twelve per cent. Innumerable rumors, some plausible and some ridiculous, were started as a pretext for the decline, but none of them proved to be well founded. At the close of the week the downward tendency was checked by the purchases of those who were left in the lurch, and an upward reaction was established. The only considerations

which affect railroad stocks that are different from what they were ten days ago are that the grain receipts at the lake ports have fallen below last year's, and that there has been another advance in the rates charged by the trunk lines. The New York banks keep up their reserve surprisingly well, but money is in good demand at 7 per cent. As was expected, bills have already been introduced into Congress to repeal the Resumption Act and to remonetize silver. The latter advanced the price of silver in London to 55½*d.*, which would make the gold value of the bullion in a 412½-grain silver dollar about 93½ cents. The gold value of the "paper dollar" at the close of the week was \$0.9708.

The situation in France remains unchanged. The Assembly meets on the 5th prox., and there are rumors, which are often contradicted and as often repeated, that the Ministry will resign on that day either wholly or in part; and if in part, that the Duc Decazes and General Berthout will remain, and the other places be filled from the Left-Centre. The valiant Fourtou is, however, in no wise discouraged, and says they are all going to remain and look after the elections of the Councils-General for the coming year in the old fashion, and has assured the prefects that he will stand by them in their little games. The importance of this lies in the fact that the coming Councils-General elect one-third of the Senate which will be in session when the time comes for revising the Constitution. It is confidently asserted by the Left of the Senate that a majority cannot be obtained in that body for a second dissolution until after at least a full session; that the country having been appealed to on the existing state of facts, its decision must be respected until a new state of facts shall have arisen. The Republicans, in the meantime, continue provokingly moderate. Even Louis Blanc acknowledges the necessity for the moment of working in concert and suppressing cherished aims and convictions. It was at first proposed that the majority should unseat all Government candidates who had issued electioneering addresses on paper of the official color, the use of this paper being restricted by law to official business; but this idea has wisely been abandoned. The present plan is to meet, pass a vote of want of confidence in the Ministry, and then vote the appropriations for the army and navy, and public debt, and pending public works, but not a cent for the salaries of ministers or functionaries, or for any expense of their maintenance. This will force the hand of the Marshal. He will have either to dismiss his ministers or attempt to levy taxes without authority of law—in other words, govern outside the Constitution; and this few people believe he has the courage to attempt.

Whether the report from Tiflis that Mukhtar Pasha's total loss in the battle of October 15 was about sixteen thousand, be nearer the truth than that other report from Karajal that he lost eighteen thousand in prisoners alone, it is certain that he suffered a crushing defeat. It may be doubted whether he succeeded in entering the fortifications of Kars with three-fifths of his army, which seems to have consisted of not fully forty thousand men. Great as may have been his folly in so long exposing himself to the sudden attacks of an overwhelming force while he could safely rest under the shelter of his fortress, due credit must be given to the Russian commanders for the skilful execution of the probably long-meditated blow. Of these Gen. Heiman, who carried the Turkish centre, Olya Tepe, seems to have borne the brunt of the fighting. What the ultimate fruits of this great victory will be to the Russians, it is too early to express an opinion upon. Much will depend upon the weather, which may or may not prevent an advance upon Erzerum, and much also on the amount of supplies accumulated in Kars, which will probably be blockaded, and can hardly count on the speedy approach of a relieving force, though reinforcements for Erzerum are already hurried on from Constantinople, via Trebizond, and from Batum. Among the immediate fruits is the evacuation of Russian Armenia by Ismail Pasha, who has recrossed the frontier near Zor,

followed by Tergukassoff. Lazareff, who is reported to have turned against him, is too far off and separated by too powerful barriers to intercept his retreat towards Erzerum by the Diadin and Karakilissa road. The Russians' loss in the battle is not yet fully known: in carrying Aladjia Dagh they lost fourteen hundred and forty killed and wounded.

Active hostilities have been resumed before Plevna, commencing with a heavy cannonade upon single points of the Turkish positions. This was considered by the Russians as very effective, and the Turks were believed to have more or less fully evacuated the second Grivitza redoubt. On Wednesday, October 17, the Czar, apparently on receiving the congratulations of his staff on the victory of his army in Asia, solemnly declared that he and all the members of the Imperial family would remain with the troops to share in their labors and witness their deeds, adding that, "if necessary, all Russia will, as once before, take up arms." The first labors in the new contest for Plevna, however, were assigned, surprisingly enough, not to the Russian troops, so strongly reinforced by the Guard, but to the Rumanian allies. On Friday they assaulted the Grivitza redoubt, but were repulsed before gaining it. They made another attempt, and the three foremost battalions leaped into the trenches, but, the Turks concentrating against them, they were forced to withdraw, after an hour's sanguinary struggle. The total loss, according to the Russian official bulletin, was upwards of nine hundred killed and wounded. About the beginning of the contest the Russians seem to have made a feeble show of fighting on the opposite side, in order to divert Osman Pasha's attention from the real point of attack. The Turks in Plevna are reported to be constructing a new interior line of defences. Their condition as to health and provisions is variously talked of. It is very bad, if deserters are "reliable gentlemen"; it is very good, if the London *Standard's* correspondence from Plevna is trustworthy. According to this source "six thousand provision-carts are now on the road to Plevna"—a piece of information which may possibly compensate the Russians for what they lately suffered through a similar feat of reporting enterprise, for which another *Standard* correspondent has been expelled by them from Rumania. The *Standard's* impartiality is thus vindicated.

Suleiman Pasha, active and daring as he is, has found the Russians too strong and the roads too bad for an aggressive movement on his part, and after reconnoitring the enemy's positions west of the lower Lom, has fallen back on the Rustchuk-Rasgrad line, retaining advanced posts at Kadiköi, north of the Ak (White) Lom, and at Solenik, south of it, between Torlak and Katzelevo. This withdrawal relieves the Russian Crown Prince's forces from a long-sustained and severe pressure, and may dispose him to give up some of his fresh reinforcements for the benefit of the army before Plevna. To judge by movements in the Dobrudja, where Gen. Zimmermann's forces have recently been active all around, detachments of them appearing in the neighborhood of Silistria, around Bazarjik, and near Kavarna, an advance of the Crown Prince against Suleiman, in co-operation with Zimmermann in the rear of the Turkish commander-in-chief's extensive positions, seems to be contemplated, and an attack by the Russians on Solenik on Monday is reported from Shumla. Bad weather and worse roads, however, appear to be a check on all movements requiring days' marching. The Russian communications on both sides of the Danube are described as frightfully wretched. To remedy the evil, according to late reports, the Russians have contracted for the construction of railways which are to connect Simnitsa with Giurgevo, and Sistova with Plevna and Timova: across the Danube, between Simnitsa and Sistova, the cars are to be carried on ferry-boats, on the American plan. Shipka is left out of the scheme. No fighting is reported from that quarter, and none from beyond the Vid. The Prince of Montenegro has dismissed the bulk of his troops "to sow the crops," and Milan of Servia continues to negotiate.

PACIFIC RAILROAD LEGISLATION.

AT the close of the last Congress there was pending in the Senate a bill to provide for the settlement and liquidation of the indebtedness of the Union and Central Pacific Railroads to the United States. Two bills had been reported for this purpose, proceeding upon very different principles—the one by the Judiciary Committee, the other by the Pacific Railroad Committee. The bill of the Judiciary Committee went upon the theory that, inasmuch as the act of 1864 subordinating the Government's mortgage on these roads to another mortgage of equal amount, and doubling the land-grant to the companies—both of which privileges had been accepted by them—reserved the right on the part of Congress "to alter, amend, or repeal," it was therefore competent for Congress to prescribe by law what sum or sums should be paid into the Treasury annually by these companies out of their net earnings in liquidation of their indebtedness to the Government. This view of the scope of legislative powers would seem to have been sustained by the decision of the Supreme Court in one of the Wisconsin railroad cases, wherein the reserved right to alter, amend, or repeal has been given even a wider latitude than was claimed for it by the supporters of the Judiciary Committee's bill. The act of 1862 incorporating the Pacific Railroad companies, and making certain grants to them, prescribed that they should pay into the Treasury "at least five per cent." of their net earnings each year in liquidation of their Government debts. This act also reserved the right to alter, amend, or repeal, coupled with the proviso that it should be exercised with "due regard to the rights of the companies." No work was done under the act of 1862, and it was declared by the moving spirits of the enterprise that none could be done. Accordingly the act of 1864 was passed, with its additional grants and its enlarged proviso as to the power of amendment.

The Judiciary Committee's bill was straightway opposed by the Supreme Court decision in the case of "The United States *v.* The Union Pacific Railroad Company," involving the right of the Government to withhold the entire amount of earnings of these companies for the transportation of troops, mails, and Government property, instead of one-half. The court held the law of the case to be that the indebtedness of the companies to the Government, whether in the way of interest or principal, would not be due until the maturity of the bonds, about the year 1895; and that only one-half of the transportation earnings could be withheld to be applied to such indebtedness. Senator Christiancy, supporting the Judiciary Committee's bill, pointed out the fact, sufficiently obvious, that the Supreme Court had not undertaken to decide what laws Congress might pass on this subject, or what validity such laws would have, but what laws Congress had actually passed, and how they were to be interpreted and enforced. The law as it stands calls for one-half of the transportation earnings, and at least five per cent. of net earnings, to be applied to the liquidation of an indebtedness maturing in 1895. This was all that the court decided, or could decide. Nevertheless, the decision was made the reason or pretext for substituting for the Judiciary Committee's bill another bill of very different character. This bill, introduced by Senator Gordon, of Georgia, and adopted by the Pacific Railroad Committee, had its origin in the councils of the Union Pacific Railroad Company.

Two years or more ago the president of this company addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury suggesting that the indebtedness of his company to the Government was getting to be so large that it ought to be a matter of serious concern to the creditor, and that it seemed to be a fit subject for compromise. Terms of compromise were mentioned, the substance of which was a small semi-annual payment to be made by the company, amounting to about one-third of the accruing interest on the debt, interest on these payments to be compounded semi-annually until the whole should be equal to the principal of the subsidy bonds with simple interest computed from the date of their issue. This plan made light of the fact that the debt would be actually due in 1895, and that any extension of it beyond that time would be the same thing

as a new subsidy to a completed, and, as matters now stand, a highly prosperous, dividend-paying, road. It concealed, or at all events involved, the fact that the interest to be paid by the company on the proposed new subsidy—the subsidy commencing in the year 1895—would, under the arrangement, be but a trifle more than three per cent. per annum, and simple interest at that, while the allowance by the Government to the company on all amounts paid into the Treasury was to be at six per cent., compounded semi-annually. The framers of this plan of settlement doubtless took the idea from the problem in the school arithmetics, How long will it take for one cent invested at compound interest to buy all the property in the world? It was rather too much for even a Louisiana carpet-bagger to sanction. Accordingly, the Pacific Railroad Committee, under the superior guidance of Senator West, fixed the year 1912 as the date at which the compound interest juggle should terminate and the whole debt should be settled and paid. This was the same thing as granting a new subsidy of seventeen years' duration—the original one having been for thirty years—at a reduced rate of interest after the year 1895. Senator Booth offered an amendment to the Railroad Committee's Bill requiring that the whole debt should be paid at its maturity under existing laws, which was rejected by yeas 24, nays 23, most of the carpet-baggers voting in the negative. Finally, Senator Morrill moved that the bill be laid upon the table, and Senator Sherman suggested as an amendment that it be postponed till the next session, urging with great force that the measure was of too much importance to be disposed of in the crush of the last hours of an expiring Congress, and pointing out the fact that there had been no investigation into the financial condition of the two companies, and that even their annual reports for the preceding year had not been received by the Senate. This motion was vigorously opposed by Senators West and Conkling, but it prevailed by yeas 29, nays 28. Senator Thurman has just introduced a bill embodying the principles of the Judiciary Committee's bill at the present session.

The liability of the Central and Union Pacific Companies to the Government at the present time is about \$38,000,000 each, and the annual interest accumulating against them is about \$1,600,000 each, less the amounts earned by them for Government transportation. The Union Pacific Company is paying dividends of 8 per cent. per annum to stockholders, besides accumulating an unknown sum described in its annual reports as "floating assets." The Central Pacific is in a more flourishing condition even, and though it is a matter of public record that the stock of both companies is largely an ideal creation, for the purposes of this article the shares will be treated as capital paid up in accordance with the requirements of law. The Government's lien is acknowledged to be a second mortgage, but inasmuch as there are third mortgages on the property which command a high price in the market, as well as a large capital stock interested in the permanent well-being of the property, no reasons are apparent for sacrificing the claim of the Treasury or abating it in any degree whatever. Nevertheless, reasons were advanced in behalf of the Railroad Committee's bill, by the supporters of that measure, which will undoubtedly be repeated this winter, and which we will briefly consider.

Setting aside the testimony offered to show how much the Government has gained indirectly by having a railway through the Western territories, as irrelevant and as fully balanced by the profits made by the companies in the construction and operation of the road, there remains but one argument, so far as has been disclosed by the debates, in favor of the bill, viz., that if the Government does not take what is here offered it will fare worse. This threat—for it is nothing else—runs through the whole discussion, in language more or less conciliatory and more or less minatory, commencing with the first proposal of the company to the Government; but it was not relied upon exclusively, as would appear from the remarks of Senator Booth, who called attention one day to the fact that the lobbyists of the bill had invaded the floor of the Senate in such numbers that Senators were nearly crowded out of their chairs. The theory presented by the advocates of the bill was that the amount due from

the two companies at the maturity of the subsidy bonds, as things are now going on, would be more than they can pay, and more than the property will then be worth after deducting the amount of the first mortgages; therefore, as half a loaf is better than no bread, it is the dictate of wisdom to relinquish a part of the claim in order to secure the remainder. The proper reply to such a threat would be something like this: "You (debtor) tell me (creditor) that although you are able to pay the debt, I am not able to collect it. We will see about that. I will first exhaust my remedies, and if they fail I will consider your plan of compromise." A mortgagee having the power of legislation over the mortgagor is not usually considered to be in a disadvantageous position if the mortgaged property is worth the debt. This is the position in which the Government stands to the Pacific Railway Companies. If it be contended that Congress has not the power of legislation over the companies to the extent at least of protecting its own claim, that may be a fair subject of dispute and of litigation in the courts; but to say that because the companies or their agents deny this power of legislation, therefore it is not worth while to have any lawsuit about it, is to abandon the Government's case at the outset. This is what was done by several Senators in set speeches, without any consciousness of the fact that they were betraying their own client. They were ready to give up a case involving a vast sum of money, not only without exhausting their remedies but without even resorting to them. The reserved power of amendment and repeal is of little worth if it cannot be exercised to prevent the debtor companies from running off with the creditor's money. It is plain from the language of the original act (that of 1862) that the right to exact a portion of the net earnings as security for the liquidation of the debt was one of the governing ideas of the law, and that it was not intended to be limited to five per cent. or any other figure, but was left open to be fixed according to the future revenues of the property. *A fortiori* does the act of 1864, with its larger grants and its more complete reservations of legislative control, confirm this view. No Senator has the right to say that he will not sanction further litigation to enforce the claims of the Government against these companies. If he is not in the Senate to protect the just claims of the Government by all lawful means, he ought not to be there at all. It is not doing violence to the proprieties of speech or to the facts of the case, to say that these companies spend twelve months in every year in swindling the Government or devising means to do so, and it is disheartening to hear Senators, who have perhaps given the subject a few days' consideration, and have not even made an investigation of the particular matter in hand, declaring that they will do nothing to enforce the rights of the Government lest perchance it should lead to the unpleasantness of a lawsuit.

THE LAW OF PANICS.

IN discussing "Panics" some years ago (Sept. 23, 1873) we drew attention to a fact which we think had previously been little noticed—that the interval between them is twice as great in this country as in England, and that it is only this country and England and France which have until very recently been exposed to them. Since 1870 they have begun to appear in Austria and Germany, and even Russia, which have had one apiece. In England the first was in 1797; the others have followed in 1807, 1817, 1826, 1837, 1847, 1857, and 1866, or at intervals of about ten years. In this country the first was in 1815, and they recurred in 1836, 1857, and 1873, or at intervals of about twenty years. The reason why they appeared first in England and next in this country is the earlier development in these two countries not only of commercial and industrial enterprise, but of the system of buying and selling on credit—that is, not with money, but with promises to pay money. Without credit you cannot have panics. They do not show themselves in an agricultural community, or a barbarous or insecure community. They have never been known on the greater part of the European continent until now, for the same reason assigned by Mr. Bright for the absence in that

region until very recently of banks of issue. The sense of insecurity consequent on long familiarity with wars and invasions was so strong, and the belief in the possibility of war or invasion at any moment so deep, that no bank could make arrangements for the run that would surely follow the outbreak of hostilities; and in view of this contingency nobody would be willing to hold paper promises to pay in lieu of gold and silver.

That England has been, during the last seventy-five years, more panicky than the United States, is due in part to the more rapid growth and greater volume and extent of her trade and industry, but also, there can be little question, in part to the fact that panic is a mental condition which may be warded off by a more hopeful temper or less dread of the consequences of failure. In other words, to repeat what we said in 1873 on the same subject, "the extent of our resources and the greater ratio of increase of population make it harder to overdo the work of production in this country than in England, and to this we must add the greater strength of nerves produced by greater hopefulness."

But the cause of panics is the same in both countries. New men take hold of business on a rising wave, and push the work of producing and exchanging by every means in their power, until, all of a sudden, demand begins to slacken, and then everybody takes fright, and credit collapses. What is most curious about the process is, however, that almost up to the day of the panic few, if any, suspect that there is any danger ahead. The prosperity seems sound and healthy. People are all buying much because they have much to spend. Merchants are giving their notes freely for goods because experience justifies the belief that the goods will be got rid of easily. Workingmen are receiving high wages, because employers are making large profits, and they are making large profits because there is an active market. In short, whichever way we look, or whatever tests we employ, we detect nothing wrong. Moreover, though there are, of course, always croakers in prosperous seasons, there are none whose croaking is entitled to much attention by reason of their position or reputation. The leading capitalists, manufacturers, financiers, and economists almost always join in the general chuckle over the condition of business. The elaborate explanations of the causes of the collapse always come after it has occurred and when everybody knows all about it. Now, as we said two weeks ago, he would confer a great benefit on the civilized world who would furnish a trustworthy sign that a panic was near at hand, and who would, in scientific phrase, discover the law of panics, and thus enable prudent men to disregard the general hopefulness and restrict their dealings before the crash came. The great difficulty in the way of any such discovery, of course, lies in the fact that the panics which have already occurred are too few in number to furnish materials for any generalization of much value. At this moment people in both hemispheres are naturally more interested in the signs of approaching recovery than in those of impending ruin, but it is easy to see that if any such signs could be discovered they would be as good in the one case as in the other. The signs that business is improving and that the tide of prosperity has begun to flow, are the same signs on which we must rely to tell us when we are near high water and the subsequent ebb.

The signs which have been selected in this country by some financial writers are the Clearing-House returns. In the clearing-houses, which exist in all the great cities, the banks settle their accounts by an exchange of the checks deposited in each against those held against it by the others, and it is argued that, as the number and amount of these checks are large and increasing, it shows that business is improving, and improving in the ratio of the increase. The same test has been resorted to in England by those who are looking eagerly for good times, and it has been found encouraging, as the London Clearing-House returns show an increase for a considerable time, compared with the corresponding period of last year. The money article in the London *Times* points out, however, that this test is undoubtedly fallacious there, first, owing to the fact that the London clearings only represent a very small proportion of the check payments of the country at large, there being only twenty-

six banks in the House, and few of these having any country agency; and, next, because not only is a multiplicity of check-payments not a sign of active trade, "but it is extremely probable that a time of dull trade may directly act as a stimulus to payment by check, persons being more and more driven to trade within their means, or, in other words, without bills." The writer holds that the true sign of a revival of trade is a sharp demand for money, indicated by a high rate of interest and a plentiful issue of bills for discount. In this country, the Clearing-House returns are of more value as an indication of *something* than those of London, because we get them from a considerable number of business centres scattered over a very wide area; but it may well be questioned whether they furnish any better indication of the condition of business, or rather whether large returns show that business is reviving. Here, as well as there, the demand for money is the one sure sign of improving trade, and after it comes an increase in the number of discounts—or, in other words, a revival of credit. But the condition of the money market is, on the other hand, harder to get at here than in England or France, because we have no great central bank, like the Bank of England or the Bank of France, which feels the pressure on the market, and records it in its rate of interest from day to day. The credit system in England, too, is so concentrated in London—that is, all commercial bills are so sure to find their way there, sooner or later—that if there were any direct and accurate means of ascertaining the number of them afloat, it would furnish a very accurate test of the condition of business. There is no such means. That bills are increasing or decreasing, however, is ascertained in a general way by the rise or fall in the rate of interest. Moreover, there is, in France and England, a mode of ascertaining whether they are increasing or diminishing which is not within our reach here, and that is the amount discounted at the Bank of England and the Bank of France. From the tables they furnish on this point a writer in the last number of the *Journal des Economistes*, M. Clément Juglar, has endeavored to show that in England and France a steady rise in the amount of discounts for about six years ends in a crisis; that this is followed by four or five years of a decline in the amount of discounts, and that the cessation of this decline marks the close of the crisis and the turning of the tide; and that there is a tolerably steady relation between this flow and ebb of the discounts and the amount of metallic reserve, and circulation, and deposits. His tables our space will not permit us to reproduce, but they go to show that both in the Bank of England and that of France, beginning with the year 1832, every crisis has been preceded by about six years of steadily rising discounts, steadily declining metallic reserve, and diminishing note circulation, and has been followed for about the same period by reverse movements; and that when these last are arrested it has always been a sign that the revival has begun, the rate of interest running up to 10 per cent. at the moment of the crisis and declining to 2 per cent. at the moment of the beginning of the revival. According to this theory the tide is now just turning.

THE CHURCH AS AN AID TO GOOD CONDUCT.

THE Episcopal Church, at the late Triennial Convention, took up and determined to make a more vigorous effort to deal with the problem presented by the irreligion of the poor and the dishonesty of church members. It is an unfortunate and, at first sight, somewhat puzzling circumstance that so many of the culprits in the late cases of fraud and defalcation should have been professing Christians, and in some cases persons of unusual ecclesiastical activity, and that this activity should apparently have furnished no check whatever to the moral descent. It is proposed to meet the difficulty by more preaching, more prayer, and greater use of lay assistance in church-work. There is nothing very new, however, about the difficulty. There is hardly a year in which it is not deplored at meetings of church organizations, and in which solemn promises are not made to devise some mode of keeping church members up to their professions and gathering more of the churchless working-classes into the fold; but somehow there is not much visible progress to be recorded. The church scan-

dals multiply in spite of pastors and people, and the workingmen decline to show themselves at places of worship, although the number of places of worship and of church members steadily increases.

We are sorry not to notice in any of the discussions on the subject a more frank and searching examination of the reason why religion does not act more powerfully as a rule of conduct. Until such an examination is made, and its certain results boldly faced by church reformers, the church cannot become any more of a help to right living than it is now, be this little or much. The first thing which such an examination would reveal is a thing which is in everybody's mind and on everybody's tongue in private, but which is apt to be evaded or only slightly alluded to at ecclesiastical synods and conventions: we mean the loss of faith in the dogmatic part of Christianity. People do not believe in the fall, the atonement, the resurrection, and a future state of reward and punishment at all, or do not believe in them with the certainty and vividness which are needed to make faith a constant influence on a man's daily life. They do not believe they will be damned for sin with the assurance they once did, and they are consequently indifferent to most of what is said to them of the need of repentance. They do not believe the story of Christ's life and the theory of his character and attributes given in the New Testament, or they regard them as merely a picturesque background to his moral teachings, about which a Christian may avoid coming to any positive conclusion. No man who keeps himself familiar with the intellectual and scientific movements of the day, however devout a Christian he may be, likes to question himself as to his beliefs about these matters, or would like to have to define accurately where his faith ended and his doubts began. If he is assailed in discussion by a sceptic and his combativeness roused, he will probably proclaim himself an implicit and literal acceptor of the Gospel narratives; but he will not be able to maintain this mental attitude alone in his own room. The effort that has been made by Unitarians and others to meet this difficulty by making Christ's influence and authority rest on his moral teachings and example, without the support of a divine nature or mission or sacrifice, has failed utterly. The Christian Church cannot be held together as a great social force by his teaching or example as a moral philosopher. A church organized on this theory speedily becomes a lecture association or a philanthropic club, of about as much aid to conduct as Free-Masonry. Christ's sermons need the touch of supernatural authority to make them impressive enough for the work of social regeneration; and his life was too uneventful, and the society in which he lived too simple, to give his example real power over the imagination of a modern man who regards him simply as a social reformer.

This decline of faith in Christian dogma and history has not, however, produced by any means a decline in religious sentiment, but it has deprived religion of a good deal of its power as a means of moral discipline. Moral discipline is acquired mainly by the practice of doing what one does not like, under the influence of mastering fear or hope. The conquest of one's self, of which Christian moralists speak so much, is simply the acquisition of the power of doing easily things to which one's natural inclinations are opposed; and in this work the mass of mankind are powerfully aided—indeed, we may say, have to be aided—by the prospect of reward or punishment. The wonderful results which are achieved in the army, by military authority, in inspiring coarse and common natures with a spirit of the loftiest devotion, are simply due to the steady application by day and by night of a punishing and rewarding authority. The loss of this, or its great enfeeblement, undoubtedly has deprived the church of a large portion of its means of discipline, and reduced it more nearly to the rôle of a stimulator and gratifier of certain tender emotions. It contains a large body of persons whose religious life consists simply of a succession of sensations not far removed from one's enjoyment of music and poetry; and another large body, to whom it furnishes refuge and consolation of a vague and ill-defined sort in times of sorrow and disappointment. To these persons the church prayers and hymns are not trumpet-calls to the battle-field, but soothing melodies, which give additional zest to home comforts and luxuries, and make the sharper demands of a life of the highest integrity less bearable. Nay, the case is rather worse than this. We have little doubt that this sentimental religion, as we may call it, in many cases deceives a man utterly as to his own moral condition, and hides from him the true character and direction of the road he is travelling, and furnishes his conscience with a false bottom. The revelations of the last few years as to its value as a guide in the conduct of life have certainly been plain and deplorable.

The evil in some degree suggests the remedy, though we do not mean to say that we know of any complete remedy. Church-membership ought

to involve discipline of some kind in order to furnish moral aid. It ought, that is to say, to impose some restraint on people's inclinations, the operation of which will be visible, and enforced by some external sanction. If, in short, Christians are to be regarded as more trustworthy and as living on a higher moral plane than the rest of the world, they must furnish stronger evidences of their sincerity than are now exacted from them, and evidences which, instead of being the indulgence of personal taste, will consist of plain and open self-denial. The church, in short, must be an organization held together by some stronger ties than enjoyment of weekly music and oratory in a pretty building, and almsgiving which entails no sacrifice and is often only a tickler of social vanity. There is in monasticism a suggestion of the way in which it must retain its power over men's lives, and be enabled to furnish them with a certificate of character. Its members will have to have a good deal of the ascetic about them, but without any withdrawal from the world. How to attain this without sacrificing the claims of art, and denying the legitimacy of honestly-acquired material power, and, in fact, restricting individual freedom to a degree which the habits and social theories of the day would make very odious, is the problem to be solved, and, there is no doubt, a very tough one. General inculcation of "plain living" will not solve it, as long as "plain living" is not defined, and the "self-made man" who has made a great fortune and spends it lavishly is held up to the admiration of every schoolboy. The church has been making of late years a gallant effort to provide accommodation for the successful, and enable them to be good Christians without sacrificing any of the good things of this life, and, in fact, without surrendering anything they enjoy, or favoring the outside public with any recognizable proof of their sincerity. We do not say that this is reprehensible, but it is easy to see that it has the seeds of a great crop of scandals in it. Donations in an age of great munificence, and horror of far-off or unattractive sins, like the slaveholding of Southerners and the intemperance of the miserable poor, are not, and ought not to be, accepted as signs of inward and spiritual grace, and of readiness to scale "the toppling crags of duty."

The conversion of the working classes, too, it is safe to say, will never be accomplished by any ecclesiastical organization which sells cushioned pews at auction, or rents them at high rates, and builds million-dollar churches for the accommodation of one thousand worshippers. The passion for equality has taken too strong hold of the workingman to make it possible to catch him with cheap chapels and "assistant pastors." He will not seek salvation in *formâ pauperis*, and thinks the best talent in the ministerial market not a whit too good for him. He not unnaturally doubts the sincerity of Christians who are not willing to kneel beside badly-dressed persons in prayer on the one day of the week when prayer is public. In fact, to fit the Protestant church in this country to lay hold of the laboring population a great process of reconstruction would be necessary. The congregational system would have to be abandoned or greatly modified, the common fund made larger and administered in a different way. There would have, in short, to be a close approach to the Roman Catholic organization, and the churches would have to lose the character of social clubs which now makes them so comfortable and attractive. Well-to-do Christians would have to sacrifice their tastes in a dozen ways, and give up the expectation of æsthetic pleasure in public worship. There cannot be a vast Gothic cathedral for the multitude in every city. The practice of the church would have to be forced up to its own theory of its character and mission, which would involve serious collision with some of the most deeply-rooted habits and ideas of modern social and political life. That there is any immediate probability of this we do not believe. Until it is brought about, its members must make up their minds to have religious professions treated by some as but slight guarantees of character, and by others as but cloaks for wrong-doing, hard as this may be for that large majority to whom they are an honest expression of sure hopes and noble aims.

FOREIGN NAMES.

II.

IN establishing rules for the spelling of foreign names a dividing line must first of all be drawn between names belonging to languages which, like the English, use the Roman alphabet and those belonging to languages whose alphabets are different. The German is included in the first class of languages, since, besides its modified form of the Gothic, it also uses the Roman letters.

The principal rule for the whole first division is: Write every word as

you find it in the respective language, using every letter and sign commonly or frequently used in English works on foreign topics, and, whenever practicable, also substitutes for letters and signs peculiar to certain languages, and not generally understood by educated English readers. To give examples, write, without regard to pronunciation, *Alençon*, *Angoulême*, *Mezières*; *Cid*, *Salvâ*, *Marañon*; *Minho*, *Maranhão*; *Cantù*, *Civilà Vecchia*; *GütZ*, *Rückert*; *Mickiewicz*, *Czartoryski*; *Deák*, *Eötvös*, etc. All these names are exactly so written by writers in the respective languages, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German, Polish, and Hungarian, and the peculiar signs which mark some of them are understood by many English readers and already widely used in English literature. To write, according to the sound, *Tchartoryski*, instead of *Czartoryski*, would be as absurd as writing *Tchaldecnee* for *Cialdini*. On the other hand, it would be equally useless and troublesome to write, according to the strict Polish usage, *Częstochowa*, instead of the common substitute *Czenstochowa*, or *Kościuszko*, with a softened *s*; as the value of *ç* or *š* is hardly known to one out of ten thousand English readers. The mark above the *s* may safely be ignored, and *en* is a good substitute for *ç*. Such is also *ø* for the Danish *þ*, as in *Jørgen*, and for the Hungarian *ő*, as in *Petőfi*; and we justly write *Abo*, instead of *Äbo*, as the Swedes have it, and call the great rivers of Sweden Tornea, Lulea, Pitea, etc., always ignoring the circular mark above the *a*, although it changes the sound. Of course, all this refers only to the general use of forms, when we apply our own names to men or places; when, in an explanatory way, the original rendering is to be fully stated, the strictest reproduction is required.

An important exception to the general rule is this: Whenever there is a well-established English form for a foreign name, that is to be preferred to the stricter national form. Hardly anybody writes *Venezia* for Venice, *Napoli* for Naples, *Kjöbenhavn* for Copenhagen, *Warszawa* for Warsaw, *Trento* or *Trient* for Trent, *Praha* for Prague, or *Wien* for Vienna; few write *Köln* for Cologne, *München* for Munich, or *Livorno* for Leghorn; and the best English usage still prefers *Lyon*, *Marseilles*, *Brussels*, *Ghent*, *Mentz*, *Leipsic*, *Cleves*, and *Trier* to the national names *Lyon*, *Marseille*, *Bruxelles*, *Gand*, *Mainz*, *Leipzig*, *Kleve*, and *Trier*. The time is surely not far off when writers of eminence will inaugurate sounder literary usages, but it will be the task of new Macaulays, Carlyles, and Prescotts to lead in the reform; writers for encyclopedias, gazetteers, and journals can do no better than slowly follow.

In the same way in which English history speaks of the treaty of Ghent, of the battle of Leipsic, of the council of Trent, or of the capture of Warsaw, giving preference to its own established forms above similar and more correct foreign ones, it has also arbitrarily decided between the rival claims of nationalities as to names of places, and there can be no appeal from its decision. We must still state, following our German guides in history, that Wallenstein was assassinated at Eger in Bohemia, though we have learned that the Bohemian name of that town is Cheb; that Maria Theresa appeared before the Hungarian diet at Presburg, though Hungarians correctly tell us that their diet was then held at Pozsony; that the capital of Austrian Poland is Lemberg, though the Poles call it Lwów, and the capital of Croatia, Agram, though called Zagreb by the Croats. This historical usage, however, must be confined within narrow limits. Wherever the proper national form is similar to the historical, and the latter not exclusively used, the former is to be selected. Thus, *Poltava* is to be preferred to *Pultowa*, *Kaisers* to *Kaisel*, *Breisach* to *Brisach*, *Mühlhausen* to *Mulhouse*, *Basel* to *Basle* or *Bâle*, *Bern* to *Berne*, *Zürich* to *Zurich*, while, on the other hand, *Komárom* is not to be substituted for *Comorn*, *Torun* for *Thorn*, or *Gdansk* for *Dantzic*. As a rule it can be stated that the English usage decidedly prefers the German names to the Polish in Posen and other Prussian provinces, and to the Czech in Bohemia and Moravia, but more rarely to the Magyar and Slavic in the countries of the Hungarian crown; the Polish, with few exceptions, to the German or Russian in the so-called Kingdom of Poland and in Galicia; the Russian always to the Polish in Lithuania, Volhynia, Podolia, and Ukraine; and the French sometimes to the German on or near the Rhine. Such exceptional French names, however, as *Aix-la-Chapelle* for Aachen, *Coire* for Chur, *Lucerne* for Luzern, are becoming rare, and *Soleure* may now safely be given up for *Solothurn*, *Deux-Ponts* for *Zweibrücken*, and *Jülich* for *Jülich*. *Mayence* is probably as often used as *Mentz*, and *Mainz* may be equally good; but the writer must make his choice, in this as in similar cases, and cling to it, refraining from giving us a sing-song like this (in Murray's 'Continent'): "Mayence, the *Moguntiacum* of the Romans. . . . The most remarkable objects in Mainz, . . . St. Boniface. . . . first archbishop of Mayence."

... The Elector of Mainz. ... Its tower commands the best view of Mayence. ... Mainz was the cradle of the art of printing. ... Mayence carries on a great trade. ... A bridge ... unites Mainz to Cassel, or Castel. ... Station in Mayence," etc.

Classical Greek names must be exceptionally grouped with those originally written in Roman letters. The English have taken them all not from the original texts but from Latin transcribers, and only such independent specialists as Grote can afford to call Hellenic men and places by their proper Hellenic names, such as Alkibiadēs, Kleisthenēs, Kyrōnē, and Pheidōn, for which English writers have learned from Cicero, Nepos, and other Romans to substitute Alcibiades, Clisthenes, Cyrene, and Phidon. Those ancient Persian, Median, Lydian, and Egyptian names, too, which we have learned from the Greeks and Romans, must remain in popular works as the Latin texts have them: Cyrus, Cyaxares, Cresus, Amasis, etc. The Latin terminations are often dropped or altered, and the popular English names which arise from the change are universally adopted. Thus, even Grote knows only King Philip, Athens, and Thebes, not Philippus, Athenā, or Thebā. Where our knowledge is derived from sources discovered in modern times, such as hieroglyphs or cuneiform inscriptions, strict transliteration is required. We then say, with George Rawlinson, Sheshonk, Osorkon, etc., or, after Brugsch, Sebek-hotep, Shasu, etc., omitting the latter's dot under the *h* in "hotep," as proper only in scholarly dissertations, and substituting in "Shasu" for his *š* the plain English equivalent *sh*. Our *kh* and *k* are good equivalents for his *χ* and *q*. The Egyptologist's or Assyriologist's way of spelling must, of course, be closely studied before transliteration is attempted. The *ch* alone, as found in various applications in Brugsch, Ebers, Rougé, Chabas, Mariette, and others, has caused a great deal of confusion in English books. Hence it probably is, *e. g.*, that the classical Cheops appears as Shufu in Rawlinson's 'Manual of Ancient History' and in the 'American Cyclopædia,' and as Khufu in the English edition of Lenormant's 'Ancient History of the East,' in the new 'Britannica,' and in the 'Condensed American Cyclopædia,' which, on better information, dropped the form used by its predecessor. Philip Smith, in his 'Ancient History of the East,' avoiding a difficulty, writes *Chufu*. But here again the question arises, How is the word to be pronounced? Was the name of the pyramid-builder Tehufu, Shufu, Khufu, or Kufu?

Corresponding to the difference between classical and modern Greek names is the difference between Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew names. For the Biblical, which the English have not taken from the Hebrew or Greek originals, but from the Vulgate and the patristic writers, we have a plain rule: They are to be written as we find them in the English Bible. To call (in popular writing, we repeat) the great Hebrew prophets by their original names, Mosheh, Yeshayahu, and Yirmeyahu, instead of Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, or the first and last Evangelists Matthæus or Mattithyahu and Yohannes or Yohanan, would not be quite as absurd as to speak of Yitzhak Newton or Yaakob Astor, but, to say the least, unnecessarily strange. The names of all post-Biblical Jews, too, if derived from the Scriptures, must retain their Anglicized form, and it matters not whether the bearers of them were Talmudists, mediæval rabbis, or modern celebrities. We thus speak alike of Moses (not Mosheh) Maimonides and Moses Mendelssohn, of Solomon (not Shelomoh) ben Gabirol and Solomon Judah Rappaport, of Judah (not Yehudah) the Holy and Judah Touro. On the other hand, a strict transliteration is demanded of rabbinical and other more or less pure Hebrew names which are not taken from Scriptures, and therefore have no popular English forms. And in this field, he who writes on Jewish subjects, if he is not himself possessed of sound Hebrew knowledge, will have to look for trustworthy English guides, and examine closely his German or French authorities before adopting their spellings. Unfortunately, careless imitations, even by writers of extensive knowledge, are frequent, and cyclopædias swarm with such names as Nachman, Sakkai, and Zebi, in which *ch*, *s*, and *z* (all correct in a German authority) improperly stand for the Hebrew letters of which the English equivalents are *h* (or '*h*'), *z*, and *tz* (or '*ts*').

How far this carelessness is carried may be illustrated by one striking example. Samuel Davidson, "D.D. of the University of Halle, and LL.D., London," has translated Fürst's 'Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon,' inclusive of his introductory "Contribution to the History of Hebrew Lexicography." In the lexicon proper the translator fortunately followed good English models, such as Robinson's Gesenius, and, deviating from his author, wrote *Rashi*, *Mishna*, etc., not *Raschi*, *Mischna*. But for the introductory essay on lexicography he had no English model before him, and he therefore blindly copied "*Asche*" (for *Ashe*), "*HaJa*"

(for *Haya* or '*Haya*'), "*Jezira*" (for *Yetzira*), "*Chabib*" (for *Habib*), "*Machasora*" (for *Mahazora*), "*Zemach*" (for *Tzemah*), "*Jachja Abu-Sakariyya*" (for *Yahya Abu-Zakariyya*), "*Abu Jusuf Chasdai*" (for *Abu-Yusuf Hasdai*), "*Mazliach*" (for *Matzliah*), etc., etc., and even "*Menachem*," "*Esra*," and "*Noach*"—good Biblical names in German—for *Menahem*, *Ezra*, and *Noah*! Thus, the English translator of a great Hebrew lexicon "to the Old Testament," in copying his elaborately correct German author, sets an example of ignoring both the English Bible and the Hebrew alphabet.

VERONA.

VENICE, Sept. 26, 1877.

I WOULD advise all travellers who go from Milan to Venice to stop for a little while in Verona. If they have never yet seen Italy they will take in Verona a plunge into the true Italian life, for Turin and Milan cannot be called truly Italian; they are too cosmopolitan. I arrived a few days ago at Verona, and took my lodgings in an old Italian palace, now converted into the Albergo delle due Torre, a squalid house if you look at the corners and the carpets, but having a true Italian air with its long balconies at each floor in the great interior court. My window opened on the little square before the old basilica of Santa Anastasia; I saw its quaint porch with its faded frescoes and charming marble sculptures. Right before me was a curious tomb built on the top of a wall and, so to speak, in the air. After dinner I went immediately to the famous square of the Signori. I love to mingle at once with the people, and to live their life. I found a great crowd in the square, which is, so to speak, the heart of the city. Night had already come; on all sides rose the walls of the huge palaces built in the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance. Hundreds of men, women, children, and soldiers were circulating about the statue of Dante, a modern work, which looks like a white ghost, owing to the freshness of the marble. A military band was playing for the people. In the night the square looked as it did at the time of the famous Scaligeri, whose gloomy palace, with its iron gratings, is still protected by an immense tower in the shape of a campanile. On all sides were dark passages, one being the famous passage called *Volto Barbaro* by the people since Can Signorio killed in it Can Grande with his own hand. This same ferocious Can Signorio strangled one of his brothers, which made Petrarch say, with a play on the word *cane*, that Verona, like Actæon, was devoured by its own dogs. This passage leads to the Piazza delle Erbe, the market-place, so lively by day, full of flowers, of fruits, with its market-women under huge parasols; its numberless shops; the curious old houses, with balconies, galleries, porticoes, huge frescoes half defaced by time, but still showing all sorts of painted forms. These two squares, joined by the *Volto Barbaro*, are like the two ventricles of the heart of Verona. You see immediately that the people here was sovereign; there was but one step from the market to the *municipio*, to the palace of the prince, who became always the leader of the democracy. The noise in the daytime is almost deafening; groups are formed everywhere. Verona still leads the old life of a little municipal republic.

The passage opposite the *Volto Barbaro* will bring you before the little court, surrounded by an iron fence, which is one of the jewels of Italian art. In this court are the famous tombs of the Scaligeri. For more than a century these men, imbued with the ideas which were expressed by Machiavelli in his 'Principe,' made themselves the Cæsars of the little republic; they had all the vices and virtues of their time; they were ferocious, vengeful, brave, passionate lovers of art, and some of them of literature. When, in the evening, you stand in the square of the Signori, you must imagine the palace of the Scaligeri full of attendants; sentries in uniform are going to and fro on the long balconies; torches are burning on the top of the high watchtower. The tyrant is there at home; he dares not go down into the street unless surrounded by his guards; he speaks to the people on the square from a high window, like the Doge of Venice. Even when a Scaliger dies, he cannot go far from this heart of the city, from the seat of the power of his family; his tomb is placed close by; the best sculptors of Italy are summoned, and years are spent in erecting these grand and costly monuments, which seem more like the tombs of emperors and kings than of the magistrates of a city. The expression of these curious monuments is that of an intense pride. There are three very large tombs that are little monuments in themselves, with marble roofs, which are always surmounted by the Scaliger on horseback, with his lance in his hand, and bearing on his breast the ladder (*scala*), which was the emblem of the family. You will find this ladder everywhere: in the ornaments of the magnificent iron fences, which look like iron lace, in the escutcheons carried by a number

of angels, on the sides of the cenotaphs. You will find also everywhere the curious helmets of the Scaligeri—a helmet with wings on the sides and with a dog's head (*can*) on the top. Can Signorio has his tomb surrounded by six warrior-saints, all in armor, who seem to form his court after his death; they are Saint Valentine, Saint Martin, Saint Sigismund, Saint Quirinus, Saint George, Saint Louis, the King of France. This petty tyrant of an Italian city summoned them all round him.

The tomb of this Can Signorio is the most admired of all, on account of the excessive complexity and richness of its ornamentation. For my part, I perhaps prefer the tomb of Mastino I., which is of the same size, but is a little more simple. I was excessively interested in the sculptures, which are most apparent in this last tomb. They are on the four sides of the pyramidal roof which covers the cenotaph. The four subjects chosen by the sculptor are these: 1st, Adam and Eve, with the tree of knowledge between them; 2d, Adam sitting and Eve sitting, with Cain and Abel, still in infancy; 3d, the assassination of Abel by Cain; 4th, Noah asleep, and his children. It is almost evident that the sculptor did not choose these subjects without an ironical meaning. He proposed to himself to bear his testimony against the dissensions which had existed among the Scaligeri. Can Signorio was a Cain himself; but one can hardly imagine how an artist dared to make such allusions, and to engrave them for eternity, or for centuries, on the very tomb of a Scaliger. He was fortunately aided by the religious habits of his time. Scenes from Genesis had always the first place in the ornamentation of the basilicas. On the whole, the more you look at these tombs, which are one of the holy places of art, the more you feel that the true Christian spirit is wanting in them. They express nothing but human passion, pride, ambition. You perceive in them one of the symptoms of the revolt of the flesh against the severe Christianity of the Middle Ages.

By a happy and delightful contrast Verona can show you the two extremities, as it were, of a long Christian period. In the tomb of the Scaligeri you see already the bold spirit of the Renaissance; in the basilica of San Zenone you see one of the pearls of early Christianity. While the tombs of the Scaligeri are in the noisy and crowded part of the city, the basilica of Pepin, son of Charlemagne, is now in a deserted quarter, along the Adige. The church is almost in a solitude; it rises, with its immense campanile, in a desert. The impression it gave me was all the more vivid. San Zenone may be said to be the finest type of the Roman basilica—the civic monument of men—turned into a religious church, a monument of God. There is hardly anything changed in the lines and principles of construction; only the walls rise higher. I confess a great admiration for this old style, where the round arch is not yet replaced by the irrational pointed arch. After you have admired the quaint porch, with the curious pieces of bronze still fixed on the old wooden door, its marble columns supported by lions, you enter the church by descending a few steps. The impression is very singular; these descending steps are like a reminiscence of the catacombs, of the time when Christianity had to hide itself. The church itself is the highest expression of what can be obtained by simplicity: you see nothing but the roof, with all its wooden supports, merely adorned by golden and silver stars on a grayish ground; the stone wall, without any ornament, rises above alternate huge square and round columns. The square have their capitals unadorned—mere stones slightly rounded, and showing embryonic forms of leaves, as if the vegetation had not accomplished all its work; these capitals are very fine in their simplicity; the round columns have capitals showing curious combinations of vegetable and animal forms; they have the shape of a turban. From the very entrance of the church you see the immense naked floor of the church, ending in a staircase which leads to a crypt, full of a vegetation of heavy capitals; two lateral staircases lead to the choir, which thus stands high above the people. The impression of this simple arrangement is very majestic; the eye understands at once all the uses of the church; it sees the crypt where St. Zeno's tomb lies, the choir, the roof. The ideal problems of a work of art are here solved in a perfect manner. The mind is satisfied, and can, with a sentiment of peace and comfort, descend from the huge whole into all sorts of amusing details. There is no bewilderment, no trouble in the sensation; after seeing the whole you see the parts. All over the walls and on the columns are the remains of old frescoes, painted sometimes one above the other, like manuscripts written over manuscripts. They are like thin veils of the parts; they look more like painted placards than like parts of a regular ornamentation.

It is quite clear that the representation of the human form was thought

too pagan in the early days of Christianity. It was only by degrees that the art of painting took an increasing importance in the churches; the first essays allowed were the traditional scenes from Genesis and the Old Testament generally, the figures of some apostles, the heads of saints, winged and withered bodies. Naturalism re-entered into art only in the fifteenth century. San Zenone is the type of the severe Christianity of the tenth century; it marks a curious contact between the German spirit, or rather the spirit of the barbarian, and the old Latin spirit. It is well placed at Verona, not far from the Alps, not too far from the Apennines. There are three more churches in Verona built on similar plans—the Cathedral, Santo Fermo Maggiore, and Santa Anastasia—but I have devoted myself only to the model church. I think it advisable always to mark in a place like Verona the nucleus of the artistic nebula: San Zenone for one age and the tombs of the Scaligeri for another are, so to speak, natural centres of reflection and admiration. To such places the mind can attach all its sensations; they might be called the nails of memory.

Correspondence.

A BULL AT LARGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your article on "The Ohio Defeat," in this week's *Nation*, I find the following paragraph concerning Secretary Sherman:

"Towards the end of August he (Mr. Sherman) went to Ohio and made a speech in the canvass, which treated most things well, but upon the silver question, which was ravaging the politics of the West, he said not a syllable. Most thinking men will agree with us in saying that it is fortunate that this mode of dealing with grave political problems should not succeed, and that any party or man who resorts to it should be defeated or disappointed. In short, political morality requires that every public man who refuses to take a dangerous bull by the horns should be pursued by him and well gored."

Without any discussion as to whether Mr. Sherman did or did not deserve to be gored, in common with a great many readers of the *Nation* I am exceedingly anxious to know what you propose to do with the "bull"? Are you gratified at the prospect of seeing an original "reputationist" like Mr. Pendleton occupying Mr. Sherman's former seat in the Senate? How should you like to see Gen. Ewing succeed Mr. Sherman as Secretary of the Treasury, after March 4, 1881? You seem to be pleased with the result of an election that promises to bring both these statesmen into greater political prominence.

BALTIMORE, October 18.

[Mr. Pendleton is, on the questions now pending, no worse or more dangerous "bull" than Mr. Stanley Matthews, the present and would-be future Republican Senator; in fact, he is less dangerous, because less able. We should *not* like to see General Ewing succeed Mr. Sherman as Secretary of the Treasury, after March 4, 1881, but we think the goring Mr. Sherman has just received is one of the best means of preventing so undesirable a consummation. In fact, if the Republican party were to begin to carry States on such platforms and with such candidates as those Ohio has just produced, it would make little difference who was in the Treasury in 1881. General Ewing would be just as good as anybody on either side who would be likely to get the place. To the much-loved argument, "The Democrats are just as bad," or "Are the Democrats any better?" *Corruptio optimi pessima* is a full and fatal answer.—ED. NATION.]

DOCTOR WHITNEY AND JUDGE GRANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: By a series of absurd charges James Grant has compelled me to again trespass upon your space. First, he accuses me of a breach of confidence. I did not ask Mr. Grant as to the mere existence of a bar association; I asked for special information regarding such an one. The information which his letter contains was wholly gratuitous, and does not touch the point on which confidence was requested. To consider such a reply as confidential is preposterous. Second, the intimacy of Mr. Grant with Judge Dillon I knew by general repute. Third, I did not mention Dillon in my letter of February 22, 1867, because it was a preliminary enquiry; had I filed allegations his name would have appeared. Fourth, I

did not publish Putnam & Rogers's letter of March 13, 1867, from lack of space only; it neither added to nor detracted from their first letter. In both letters they speak of the discontinuance of meetings. In the first they state that one of their firm is of the board of censors, and that I can present charges through them; in the second, they renew this offer. Had the association been dead, they would have said so distinctly. Fifth, Mr. Grant denies all knowledge or remembrance of me, and says he was in Washington at the time of the correspondence in 1867. Was he also absent at the time of a correspondence in 1866?

JAMES O. WHITNEY.

PAWTUCKET, R. I., October 17, 1877.

[This closes the controversy, so far as we are concerned.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO. send us a new and revised edition of Mr. George P. Marsh's 'The Earth as Modified by Human Action.' This work has a perennial interest for the author as well as the public, and in this respect it takes honorable rank with Mr. J. R. Bartlett's 'Americanisms' and Mr. John Bartlett's 'Familiar Quotations.' Mr. Marsh has gathered into an appendix the corrections and fresh information necessary to keep his treatise abreast of the times. Among other topics therein referred to is Prof. J. D. Whitney's view of the cause of the treelessness of prairies. Mr. Marsh seeks to counteract the effect of Prof. Whitney's discouraging remarks on the possibility of tree-culture where nature has not succeeded.—D. Appleton & Co. have republished in this country Maudsley's 'Physiology of Mind' and Allen's 'Physiological Aesthetics,' already reviewed, from the English editions, in Nos. 624, 638 of the *Nation*. They also issue in a single volume Huxley's 'American Addresses,' consisting of his three lectures on Evolution in this city, his address at the opening of the Johns-Hopkins University, and a lecture at the South Kensington Museum last December on the Study of Biology.—Estes & Lauriat have brought out in book-form, under the title of 'Our Common Insects,' several papers contributed to the *American Naturalist* by its editor, Dr. A. S. Packard, jr. They are partly scientific and partly popular in intent and manner of expression, and are freely illustrated.—Hurd & Houghton's reissue of Little & Brown's standard edition of the British Poets is continued (under the style of the Riverside Edition), by the publication together of Coleridge and Keats in two volumes, at a very moderate price. The prefatory Life of Keats records Mr. Lowell's judgment of the poet. The same house has at length produced the second part of Isaac Sprague's 'Illustrations of the Wild Flowers of America.' The interval has been turned to good account by the lithographers, who, in the four new plates, seem to have brought the art of color-printing for flowers well nigh to perfection. At least, no ordinary hand-coloring can match that of the plate of the Blue Flag or of the Columnar Cone-flower of the present fascicle. Probably this style of work is still costly; but if the publishers could see their way to reduce the price one-half, they might quadruple the sale at once and supply a real demand.—'Hawthorne, and Other Poems,' will be the title of a collection of Mr. E. C. Stedman's poems written since 1873, to be published by J. R. Osgood & Co.—Mr. William Everett is engaged on a life of his father, the late Edward Everett, and desires the loan of letters and manuscripts and communications of any character likely to assist him in his work. His address is Holmes Place, Cambridge, Mass.—The *New Englander* will next year be issued bi-monthly instead of quarterly, after the fashion set by the *International* and *North American Reviews*. Special attention will be given to the "materialistic Atheism" which, "under the name of 'science,' . . . calls for fresh vindications of the Christian Faith against old foes with new faces."—Bulletin No. 43 of the Boston Public Library contains bibliographical references on the Early History of Virginia, the Popham Colony, and the History of Mental Philosophy (Part iv.), and continues its check-list for American local history as far as Litchfield, Conn.—We regret to announce the death of Mr. John G. Anthony, for many years a devoted coadjutor of Agassiz's in the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy at Cambridge, where he had charge of the conchological department. Long residence and extensive travel in the Ohio Valley had made him our first authority on fresh-water shells. He accompanied the Thayer expedition to Brazil, but sickness prevented him from taking part in it after its arrival. In addition to his special work, Mr. Anthony

always maintained an interest in botany and horticulture. He was a native of Rhode Island, and was in the seventy-fourth year of his age.—The newest map of the seat of the war in Turkey is one, based chiefly on the Austrian map, by Keith Johnston, in the October number of the *Geographical Magazine*. For the operations around Plevna it will be found very serviceable.—A recent number of the London *Athenæum*, in a review of Hovelacque's work on linguistics, has this sentence: "For all that, philology cannot be classed as a physical science—no more than it is, what Prof. Whitney, in American fashion, calls it, an 'institution.'" Those who have given themselves the trouble to understand Professor Whitney's views know that he has never called philology anything of the kind; the blunder is, in fact, a senseless one. We might enquire whether it is English fashion, or only *Athenæum* fashion, to use such choice language as "cannot no more."

—The fall announcements of English publishers abound neither in wholly new nor very remarkable works. Nevertheless, if we begin our summary with history, we can mention three which are certain to be of first-rate quality: 'Democracy in Europe,' by Sir T. Erskine May, 'The Historical Geography of Europe,' by Edward A. Freeman, and 'The Personal Government of Charles I., 1628-1637,' by S. R. Gardiner. Victor Hugo's 'History of a Crime' of course is promised in English. We may mention also a translation of Max Duncker's 'History of Antiquity'; 'New Ireland,' by A. M. Sullivan, M.P., with a 'History of Belfast,' by G. Benn; and 'London in the Jacobite Times,' by Dr. John Doran. The chief books of travel seem to be 'Upper Egypt, its People and its Products,' by C. B. Klunzinger, M.D.; 'Travels in the Footsteps of Bruce,' by Lieut.-Col. R. Playfair; 'On Horseback through Asia Minor,' by Capt. F. Burnaby, who must have been ennuied by the absence of obstacles to his roaming; 'Dr. Beke's Discoveries of Sinai,' by Mrs. Beke; 'Khiva,' by Lieut. Hugo Stumm; 'Burmah, Past and Present,' by Major-Gen. Albert Fytche; 'Fifteen Thousand Miles on the Amazon and its Tributaries,' by C. B. Brown and W. Lidstone; 'The Land of Bolivar,' by J. M. Spence; 'A Summer Holiday in Scandinavia,' by E. L. L. Arnold; 'Under the Balkans,' by R. Jasper More; 'Among the Spanish People,' by the Rev. Hugh James Rose; and 'Through Holland,' by Charles W. Wood. Many, if not most, of the foregoing are illustrated; some very profusely. The *Challenger* expedition gives us 'The Atlantic,' a preliminary account of general results, by Sir C. W. Thompson; 'The Physical Geography of the Sea,' by Dr. W. B. Carpenter; 'Thalassa, or the Depth, Temperature, and Currents of the Ocean,' by J. J. Wild; and even a 'Challenger Album,' by the same author. Arctic exploration, on the other hand, produces 'Shores of the North Polar Sea,' by Dr. E. L. Moss; and 'The Barents Relics,' by Charles L. W. Gardner.

—In the list of biographies the 'Life of Sir Robert Walpole,' by A. C. Ewald, should find eager readers among those accustomed to defend our civil service by pointing to Walpole's for a worse. 'The Life of Pius IX.,' by T. Adolphus Trollope, may also count on a certain number of American readers, as will certainly the 'Life and Aims of Thoreau,' by H. A. Page, De Quincey's biographer. Prof. Villari's 'Machiavelli and his Times'; James Sime's (and also Helen Zimmern's) 'Life and Writings of Lessing'; King Oscar II.'s 'Memoirs of Charles XII.'; the 'Correspondence between Goethe and Schiller, 1794-1805'; Balzac's Correspondence; and the 'Memoirs of Mme. de Staël (Mlle. de Launay),' will likewise merit attention. Science musters Haeckel's 'History of the Evolution of Man'; and Viollet-le-Duc's 'Mont Blanc,' its constitution, transformations, and glaciers. A link between science and art is 'Anatomy for Artists,' by John Marshall; and in the latter domain we note also 'The History of Ceramic Art in Great Britain,' by L. Jewitt; 'The Geometry and Optics of Ancient Architecture,' Egyptian, Greek, and Roman, by John Pennethorne; Viollet-le-Duc's 'Lectures on Architecture'; and 'The History of Furniture,' by A. Jacquemont, translated and edited by Mrs. Bury Palliser. Under the head of languages, noteworthy seem a translation of Robinson Crusoe into Persian in Roman characters; a new (Ollendorffian) method for writing and speaking Russian, by Prof. Henry Riola (Trübner), with a Russian-English Dictionary, by J. Curtin (same publishers); and 'German Poetry for Repetition,' edited by C. A. Buchheim. With Lady Catherine Charlotte Jackson's 'Literary Salons of Paris in the 18th Century,' 'Spenser for Children,' by M. H. Towry, and 'Hungarian Poems and Fables for English Readers' we close our excerpts.

—The beginning of our popular magazine literature dates back—according to Mr. E. L. Burlingame's article on "Dead Magazines," in

Appleton's *Journal* for November—to the year 1752, when the *Independent Reflector* was begun in this city by Governor Livingston and the elder Aaron Burr. For the next seventy years there was a "running fire" of magazines, all of which have dropped out of existence, the names of very few being recognizable by modern readers. Some of these had a comparatively long lease of life. The *Monthly Anthology*, with which the familiar names of Tudor, Buckminster, John Quincy Adams, and Ticknor were associated as managers and writers, survived eight years, leaving the same number of solid volumes, the contents of which Mr. Burlingame ungraciously affirms must have been originally valuable chiefly as a soporific. Its home was in Boston. The *Museum of Foreign Literature* and the *Casket*, both published in Philadelphia, lasted for seventeen years, "yet hardly held one contribution that makes it worth a modern reader's while to search their pages." Very different in character was Dennie's *Port Folio* of this city, which ran for nearly twenty-five years, and is, we are told, a perfect treasury of good things. None of these, or any of the shorter-lived magazines, whose name was legion, resembled their modern successors in literary style. All of them were stilted and decorous, and filled with imitations of Addison and Steele. The connecting link between the old magazines and the new race, whose contributors are supposed to write "according to their own unregenerate instincts—naturally and in the spirit of their time," was perhaps the *New York Mirror*, started as a weekly in 1823. For several years, under George P. Morris, it closely imitated its old-school predecessors, changing its character in 1830, when it was edited by Morris, Theodore Sedgwick Fay, and N. P. Willis. Willis was, "in a sense, the true forerunner of the professional magazine writer of the present. Condemn as we may his superficiality and the tawdriness of his brilliancy; despise as we may his unscrupulousness in the use of his materials; and pronounce him, as we must, unworthy of any real dignity among honest literary reputations, it is still true that he caught in perfection what may be called the modern magazine idea." His papers were "precursors of the kind of magazine papers that were brought to their perfection years later by really great hands." The first of the later type of American magazines, the *Knickerbocker*, was begun in 1833 by Charles Fenno Hoffman, passing soon, however, into the hands of Lewis Gaylord Clark, who, for twenty-five years, wrote its "Editor's Table" and "Gossip." The *Southern Literary Messenger*, with which the name of Poe was intimately associated, *Graham's Magazine*, and *Pulnam's Monthly*, are the principal subjects of the concluding portion of Mr. Burlingame's interesting and very readable article. We cannot, however, agree with him in thinking that a history of American magazine literature "would be a rarely interesting book." There are grains of wheat enough for a good magazine article—perhaps even for several of them—but in a book the chaff, we fear, would become insufferable.

—To the end of an article on "Civil-service Reform" in the November *Galaxy* the editor of the magazine appends a note, stating that the writer, Mr. John I. Platt, "should not be confounded with the gentleman of the same family name who presided over a political convention recently held at Rochester, New York." The note is timely, for if the gentleman referred to, Conkling's Platt, should undertake to write an article on civil-service reform it would certainly be the twin of his *Galaxy* namesake's. The fact that the editor's note was thought necessary reveals, almost without reading, the character of the article. The reform advocated is the "reform" of the platform of the New York Republican Convention. The civil service, as it now exists, may not be "the best civil service on this planet," "but for all that it is a very good service," and any proposed reform should not be a reform of methods. The civil service is made up of men; it is not a machine. These men "should be in harmony with and subject to the dominant party," because "parties represent principles." "The same reason that applies to the selection of Cabinet officers applies in a lesser degree to subordinates all the way down." "The offices are . . . a sacred trust to be administered in obedience to the will of the people, and therefore only to be confided to those who are in accord with that will," etc. One might suppose that the writer knew nothing of wire-pulling and log-rolling, and had never heard of convention-packing, or that many of the "sacred trusts" are administered by the "workers" of the Congressmen who appoint them, and whom they repay by work "in kind," or that at least nine-tenths of the sixty-two thousand office-holders have work to perform of a kind with which political principles have nothing whatever to do. The first step which he proposes toward reforming the civil service is "to let it alone," to allow its few defects gradually to slough off, etc., the precise method which would meet the approval of all the "ins" and all the "workers" and all the "statesmen" of the Conkling and Platt families. "The ideal service,"

says the writer, "will not contemplate the official as a machine, but as a man." If many more articles of this character are admitted to the *Galaxy*, we shall begin to believe that its editors contemplate writers as "men" entitled by natural right to equal welcome, however puerile their productions.

—A statue of Roger Williams was dedicated last week in Providence by the city, which erected it. The orator of the occasion was Professor J. L. Diman, and his discourse was in every way worthy of the subject. It is pleasant to find the last word on a problematic character, and his much-disputed career before his expulsion from Massachusetts Bay, in accord on the Rhode Island side of the line with the last word (Dr. Henry M. Dexter's) spoken on the other. The causes which led to Roger Williams's expulsion were independent of his views, subsequently incorporated in his new commonwealth, concerning the separation of church and state—or, as is less accurately but more commonly said, concerning religious toleration. All this was conceded by Professor Diman, and the shade of Cotton Mather himself might have listened complacently to this portion of the address. On the other hand, we should suppose that no apologist of the Puritans would now be disposed to deny Williams the full measure of eulogy here bestowed on him as the first statesman who established a form of government "which drew a clear and unmistakable line between the temporal and the spiritual power." Professor Diman contrasts his protection of religious differences with the much-vaunted toleration of Calvert in Maryland, as two things not to be confounded; and he also ranks the Providence covenant above the *Mayflower* compact. The political maxim of government for the general good imbedded in the latter "was implied rather than consciously affirmed, while the principle to which Roger Williams and his associates set their hands was intentionally and deliberately adopted as the corner-stone of the new structure they were building." What follows is of course true: Williams "cleared the path which even Massachusetts has been content to tread. The principle which he laid down is now the accepted and fundamental maxim of American politics." But here the interesting enquiry is suggested whether the Puritan or the Providence principle had actually most to do with the separation of church and state in our national government. Professor Diman does not allude to this, and even leaves it a natural inference that but for Roger Williams this separation might not have taken place. Whoever has looked into the history of disestablishment in Massachusetts knows that it was brought about by development from within; and not only by the amelioration of the laws consequent upon the break-down of the theocratic idea of government, as by the "Religious Freedom Act" of 1811, but by the strict application of them, as in the Unitarian dispossession of the Orthodox churches begun in 1820. Chief-Justice Parker, in the Dedham case of that year, "insisted that he merely applied principles that had before been laid down—old principles that had been slumbering in the ecclesiastical law and policy of Massachusetts since 1780, and long before."

—From the press of Norstedt & Sons, in Stockholm, Sweden, has recently been issued a new translation of the Elder Edda. The translator is August Godecke, and he has produced not only the best Swedish version, but without doubt the most successful translation hitherto made of that celebrated collection of Old-Norse poems. This is the second Swedish translation, the first being that of A. A. Afzelius, published in 1818. In Danish we have five translations of the Elder Edda, two old ones, that of Sandvig (Copenhagen, 1783-85) and that of Finn Magnussen (Copenhagen, 1821-23), and three modern ones—viz., one by V. B. Hjort (1863), one by Fred. Winkel-Horn (1869), and one by H. G. Møller (1870). Of these, Finn Magnussen's and Sandvig's are not only out of print, but also completely antiquated; Hjort's is so flimsy, and in all respects so unlike the original, that it scarcely deserves to be mentioned. In Winkel-Horn's translation the metre is entirely different from the Old-Norse *Fornyrðislag*, and though it must be admitted that the translator in this manner has succeeded to a considerable extent in making the lays of the Elder Edda appear to us like poetry, or, as he states in his preface, "in producing an æsthetical work," still it cannot be denied that by departing from the form of the original he has sacrificed considerable of its spirit and substance. H. G. Møller has kept close to the original in form and general character, but his translation is wanting in strength and spirit. As a whole, it is heavy, stiff, and unnatural. While there is no translation of the Elder Edda in Norway, where these lays received their present form, only two in Sweden, and five in Denmark, it is a remarkable fact that Germany has produced no less than ten translations, and some of these (for instance, Simrock's) have appeared in several editions. The first German translation was that of F. H. von der Hagen, and ap-

appeared in Breslau in 1814; the last is that of B. Wenzel (Leipzig, 1877). To those who can read German we would especially recommend Karl Simrock's and Adolf Holzmann's translations. In English, the Elder Edda has been published twice; the first time by A. S. Cottle (Bristol, 1797), and the second time by Benjamin Thorpe (London, 1866). The former is worthless, while the second is rather a *transposing* than a translation. To all who can read Swedish we heartily recommend the contribution of Godecke. His work is so well done that it is difficult to conceive how those old lays could be more adequately rendered in a modern tongue. Godecke has, of course, made use of the excellent critical text-editions that have appeared during the last few years, especially those of Rugge (Christiania, 1867), of Sven Grundtvig (Copenhagen, 1874), and of Karl Hildebrand (Paderborn, 1876), and he has kept remarkably close to the original, while he has rendered every line perspicuous, vivid, and full of the characteristic ring and force of the Old Norse. Like Simrock's, this translation is carefully annotated, is furnished with a good index, etc., making in every way a satisfactory volume even to those who are not initiated into the mysteries of Edda-lore.

POETRY AND SCIENCE.*

TO explore the function of Poetry as the ally of Philosophy and Theology in answering those problems of the visible universe which Science forbears to consider—such was the object of the lectures which Principal Shairp has here knit together into a book. Just what shape the investigation should take, we presume he settled without debate or misgiving. Having, with her free consent, shut Science out of the field upon which he was entering, he felt entirely absolved from employing the scientific method of enquiry. Instead of illustrating from the poetry of all ages the increasing sensibility of man's soul to supernatural impressions from the outer world, and a progressive tendency to interpret these impressions in a certain way, our author preferred the theological method of assuming his premises. "Nature," he declares (p. 35), "as mere isolated appearance, without a mind to contemplate and a power to support it, is meaningless." Further on he says, more explicitly (p. 82): "If Nature is to be the symbol of something higher than itself, to convey intimations of Him from whom both Nature and the soul proceed, man must come to the spectacle with the thought of God already in his heart." And again (p. 83): "Neither morality nor religion will he get out of beauty taken by itself. If out of the splendid vision spread before him—the sight of earth, sea, and sky, of the clouds, the gleams, the shadows—man could arrive directly at the knowledge of Him who is behind them, how is it that in early ages whole nations, with these sights continually before them, never reached any moral conception of God? how is it that even in recent times many of the most gifted spirits, who have been most penetrated by that vision and have given it most magnificent expression, have been in revolt against religious faith? It is because they sought in Nature alone that which alone she was never intended to give." And finally (p. 84): "He who takes the opposite road, who, instead of looking to visible Nature for his first teaching, begins with the knowledge of himself, of his need, his guilt, his helplessness, and listens to the voice that tells of a strength not his own, and a redemption not in him but for him—he will learn to look on Nature with other and calmer eyes, and to discern a meaning in it which, taken by itself, it cannot give."

It appears, therefore, at the very outset, that Nature cannot satisfy man's longings and questionings, and that she refers him back—hopefully, to be sure, and with strengthened conviction—to the teachings of Philosophy and Theology. The doubts which these teachings leave in the mind, she dissipates, just as they in turn prevent her from being regarded, "taken alone," as "an inexorable and cruel Sphinx." The services which the poet and the theologian render are thus reciprocal as regards each other, but as regards mankind the poet's relation is purely subordinate. He utters a false note when he derives from the contemplation of Nature a lesson opposed to that doctrinal theology which Principal Shairp asserts to be the very key to Nature's meaning. On the other hand he owes a certain subjection to Science, since Nature can have no message in conflict with "the body of truth which Science has made good." Milton's

"Built in the eclipse, and rigged with curses dark,"

for example, is in harmony with the pagan form of the poem in which it occurs, but would no longer pass muster as a true report of Nature or of

Nature's God. Moreover, Science may be of the greatest utility to the poet by furnishing fresh material for his imagination. The two chapters to which this consideration gives rise—namely, "Will Science Put Out Poetry?" and "How Far Science May Modify Poetry"—are among the best that this volume contains.

That Science cannot modify Theology is tacitly assumed by Principal Shairp. On the same side of the line that inexorably divides the two he places man's "need, guilt, helplessness, redemption," and his origin, his destiny, the existence of a First Cause. This assumption and association are of course common to theologians, who have always sought to make disbelief in dogma synonymous with atheism. They have always resisted heresy in order to "save" the Deity, precisely as French monarchs and reactionists (to borrow an illustration from contemporary politics) have resisted progress in order to "save" France. France has not perished, as Thiers remarks in his late manifesto, but three monarchies have gone under; and in like manner dogma after dogma has been discarded, but God remains. Is there any reason for thinking that this process, by which the domain of Theology has been steadily narrowed, has now come to an end, and that there will be no more trespassing and encroachment? Or can any one appreciate the full bearing of the Development theory, and be blind to the fact that it affects not only man's rank as a created being, but his relation to the moral order and purpose of the universe? Suppose Mr. Darwin's views on the origin of the moral sense in man to prevail: will the poet of a generation taught to respect them approach Nature as her interpreter through the medium of his sense of man's "need, guilt, helplessness, redemption"; and if not, will Nature suddenly have lost her meaning? will natural piety cease to exist?

No, our author will respond; it will still exist, but it will not suffice: it is neither religion nor morality. "It cannot be denied," he says of Wordsworth, to whom he devotes the last and by far the longest chapter in the book, "that in his pure, but perhaps too confident youth, the Naturalistic spirit, so to call it, is stronger in his poetry than the Christian. He expected more from the teaching of Nature, combined with the moral intuitions of his soul, than these in themselves, and unaided, can give. He did not enough see that man needs other supports than these for the trials he has to endure." It is, in fact, only towards the close of his career, when "the moral tendency became predominant," that he appears barely to satisfy the lecturer's idea of a perfect interpreter; while as for his predecessors, neither Milton nor Cowper nor any of the English poets, from Chaucer down, here passed in review, is allowed to have dealt with the outward world in a manner to meet the requirements of the theologian. In all, the Naturalistic spirit predominates over the distinctively Christian; and we are forced to conclude on this showing that the contemplation of Nature is not favorable to orthodoxy, or that orthodoxy is unfavorable to the production of the highest poetry. This, as the result of lectures designed to induce acquaintance with the poets, is certainly discouraging. We cannot help thinking that a more cheerful prospect would have been gained by a final lecture upon Emerson, or by the simple quotation of his "Each and All" and "The Problem"—protests as ample if not as powerful as Wordsworth's "against the views of the world engendered by a mechanical deism"; and in which Nature is so far from being dumb and meaningless to those who fail to bring her a certain creed, that

"One accent of the Holy Ghost
The heedless world hath never lost."

Some of the postulates which we began by quoting open up lines of thought which would quickly take us beyond our limits. For example, it is conceded by Principal Shairp that "the ethereal blue of the sky on a fine spring day delights every man; and something of the delight is no doubt due to the mere eye, to the adaptation of the object to the visual organ." It would be in accordance with the prevailing scientific views of the day to suppose that the lower animals, through infinite gradations, also derive a pleasure from their natural environment. Association may, and in the case of the higher animals probably does, intensify this pleasure, and help to fix certain scenes or phases of Nature in their minds. That these may recur in their dreams, along with other thoughts, will hardly be contested; and if, as Jean Paul says, "the dream is an involuntary act of poetry," the imagination of the animal may even by day be busied with a genuine, if humble, attempt to take in the voice of Nature. Mr. Darwin is free to admit "that no animal is self-conscious, if by this term it is implied that he reflects on such points as whence he comes or whither he will go, or what is life and death, and so forth. But how can we feel sure that an old dog, with an excellent memory and some power of imagination, as shown by his dreams, never reflects on his past plea-

* On Poetic Interpretation of Nature. By J. C. Shairp, LL.D., Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1877.

asures or pains in the chase? And this would be a form of self-consciousness." How, too, can we feel sure that he does not feel the mystery of death, even if he does not speculate upon it? And if Houszeau's notion be correct, that when dogs bay at the moon "their imaginations are disturbed by the vague outlines of the surrounding objects, and conjure up before them fantastic images," then not only, as Mr. Darwin remarks, "their feelings may almost be called superstitious," but may be considered as on a par with the sense of the supernatural which primitive man first acquired from the inexplicable or awful phenomena of Nature, and which may or may not be regarded as the beginning of religion.

In conclusion, we venture to notice how close a scientific interpretation may be given to the familiar lines in Wordsworth's "Ode on Intimations of Immortality," beginning

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting,"

if we apply them to the doctrine of heredity, and let the instincts which are born with us, and which as we grow older are more or less overlaid and effaced by the conscious formation of our own characters and the operations of reason, stand for the heaven that "lies about us in our infancy," and fades at last "into the light of common day."

PARKMAN'S FRONTENAC.*

THE scope of Mr. Parkman's new volume is well stated in the preface:

"In 'The Old Régime in Canada' I tried to show you from what inherent causes this wilderness empire of the Great Monarch fell at last before a foe, superior indeed in numbers, but lacking all the forces that belong to a system of civil and military centralization. The present volume will show how valiantly, and for a time how successfully, New France battled against a fate which her own organic fault made inevitable." Count Frontenac himself, who died in 1698 in his seventy-eighth year, after being governor for eighteen years, he declares "the most remarkable man who ever represented the Crown of France in the New World," and adds that it was he alone who made possible "the grand scheme of military occupation by which France strove to envelop and hold in check the industrial populations of the English colonies." If the last volume dealt principally with institutions and causes, this volume, largely illustrative of the practical working of these institutions, is chiefly narrative—the first quarrelsome administration of Frontenac, the disastrous ones of De la Barre and Denonville, and then the triumphant return of Frontenac, and his revival of French glory and prestige. The Iroquois, and their relation to the two rival governments of Canada and New York, were the leading objects of concern with all three governors. The tribes of the West were safe enough allies for France so long as they could be kept at enmity with the Iroquois; and the greatest peril that threatened the French ascendancy during this period was when, under the influence of the stupid mismanagement and treachery of De la Barre and Denonville, joined with the favorable trading facilities offered by the English, the Western tribes came very near uniting with the Iroquois in an alliance with the English. The return of Frontenac, followed by active and successful enterprises on his part, and infinite tact in the management of the Indians, spoiled all this; and the volume ends with a grand gathering at Montreal (1701) of all Indian nationalities, and a hearty alliance with France. This was under Frontenac's successor, Callières, but it was the work of Frontenac.

There are two things which are especially striking to the reader of this work, which are not in themselves new, but which this narration brings into strong and vivid relief. These are the contrast in character of the French and English systems of colonization, and the nature of Indian warfare as compared with that with which we are familiar at the present day. Indian warfare is horrible enough even now, as the wars and massacres of the last few years have amply illustrated; but it has been divested of all its worst features—it is no longer the warfare of savages, but of communities which have been exposed to civilizing influences. At the period treated in this book its barbarities were at their height, because while the Indians themselves were still almost completely savage they were associated with and directed by persons of a high civilization. The Indians committed the atrocities, but their French allies encouraged them in them, and lent them the aid of their own superior intelligence. The most odious incidents in this volume are when the Jesuit missionary persuaded the Hurons to torture an Iroquois prisoner in order to ensure

enmity between the two nations (p. 205), and when Villebon, governor of Acadia, coolly remarks that he gave a prisoner (Indian) "to our savages to be burned, which they did the next day. It would not be possible to add to the torments which they made him suffer" (p. 356).

The rival systems of colonization are depicted with great force—that of France based upon feudalism, that of England upon industry; and industry carried the day, as it has done in the great movement of modern history. The whole narrative, so far as it describes the contact of the French and English colonies, illustrates this contrast, and it is admirably summed up in chap. xviii. ("French and English Rivalry"): "The rival colonies had two different laws of growth. The one increased by slow extension, rooting firmly as it spread; the other shot offshoots, with few or no roots, far out into the wilderness. It was the nature of French colonization to seize upon detached strategic points and hold them by the bayonet, forming no agricultural basis, but attracting the Indians by trade and holding them by conversion. A musket, a rosary, and a pack of beaver-skins may serve to represent it, and in fact it consisted of little else" (p. 395). Here, as in other characteristics, the English were the Romans of the modern world; for the Romans too held with the plough what they had conquered with the sword. A very striking paragraph, following that just cited, brings out another significant cause of the French failure. Whatever else it might be, New France must be Catholic, and Huguenots, driven from their homes, were "denied even a refuge in the wilderness." "Canada must be bound to the papacy, even if it blasted her." "British America was an asylum for the oppressed and the suffering of all creeds and nations, and population poured into her by the force of a natural tendency. France, like England, might have been great in two hemispheres, if she had placed herself in accordance with this tendency, instead of opposing it; but despotism was consistent with itself, and a mighty opportunity was forever lost." On page 325, and the following pages, Mr. Parkman corrects a story which has been handed down by many writers, to the effect that "Frontenac, in order to ridicule the clergy, formed an amateur company of comedians expressly to play 'Tartuffe'"—which was done with gross and insolent discourtesy. This story he shows to have originated in nothing beyond a report that "Tartuffe" was to be played, and a payment of money by the bishop in order to prevent it—the money being immediately contributed by Frontenac to the hospitals. Frontenac, indeed, although a good Catholic, was no friend to the Jesuits, who controlled the ecclesiastical affairs of the province, and with whom he was constantly at loggerheads.

As admirable specimens of Mr. Parkman's style, we will mention his description of Acadia in chap. xvi. (p. 325), and the story of the heroic defence of the Fort of Verchères by Madeleine de Verchères, a girl of fourteen (p. 392). And nothing is more characteristic of Frontenac than the incident related on page 254, of the governor leading the war-dance, "whooping like the rest. His predecessor would have perished rather than play such a part in such company; but the punctilious old courtier was himself half Indian at heart, as much at home in a wigwam as in the halls of princes. Another man would have lost respect in Indian eyes by such a performance. In Frontenac, it roused his audience to enthusiasm."

With the present volume closes the history of New France in the seventeenth century—ending with "King William's War" and the Peace of Ryswick. Yielding to the natural desire to make use of his best materials and most attractive subject, the author announces in his preface that "passing over for the present an intervening period of less decisive importance, I propose to take, as the next subject of this series, 'Montcalm and the Fall of New France.'"

Dernières Pages. Par George Sand. (Paris: Calmann Lévy. 1877.)—Madame Sand's industry was equal to her talent, and the quantity of her work was not less remarkable than the quality. Her diligence did not decline with age; the latter years of her life were indeed even more productive than the earlier ones. She wrote a large number of newspaper articles, and she was not above performing in this line the most modest functions. Obituary notices, short reviews of books, prefaces, fragmentary reminiscences—these things flowed constantly from her pen, and had always a certain value from being signed with her name. This was not their only value, for in every utterance of George Sand, however brief, there is always an appreciable touch of wisdom and grace of style. Every scrap that fell from her pen has now been collected, and these 'Dernières Pages' contain the very last possible gleanings. Most

* 'Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV. By Francis Parkman, author of 'Pioneers of France in the New World,' 'The Jesuits in North America,' 'The Discovery of the Great West,' and 'The Old Régime in Canada.' (Part V. of 'France and England in North America.') Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1877. 8vo, pp. 463.

of them are very slight, but the book is worth glancing through, for the author had this characteristic of a great mind, that her touch was never vulgar or vulgarizing, and that every now and then, even when the topic is the slightest, it strikes a charming gleam. Only three of the short articles of which this volume is composed deserve specification—the rest are mere trifles. One of these is of the most rambling character: beginning with an account of a walk in the woods in midwinter, and of some curious botanical observations, it terminates in an interesting and discriminating appreciation of the personal character of Napoleon III., who at the time the article was written was on his death-bed. Madame Sand judges the late Emperor partly from personal impressions; she relates that, at one period, having twice had an interview with him on behalf of an unfortunate person (apparently a political prisoner), she made up her mind that he was deluding her with false pretensions and not keeping faith, and left Paris abruptly, without presenting herself at a third audience. She afterwards received news not that (as in the anecdote of Louis XIV.) the King had almost waited, but that the Emperor had waited altogether. She judges him leniently and liberally, thinks him above all a dreamer, a kind of sinister Don Quixote, and says, very justly, that the French people owes it to its own self-respect not to try to make out that the sovereign to whom they submitted for twenty years was an unmitigated villain. This is what Victor Hugo so loudly proclaims; and in this case, what does Victor Hugo make of complaisant Paris, the most amiable, the most high-toned, the most exemplary city in the world?

In another article Madame Sand gives an entertaining account of her granduncle, the Abbé de Beaumont, who figures in the early pages of 'L'Histoire de ma Vie,' and upon whose portrait, having received some fresh documentary evidence about her ancestor, she desires to bestow a few flattering touches. He was the robust and handsome bastard of a great nobleman of the old régime (the Duc de Bouillon), whose only legitimate child was a helpless and peevish cripple, and the account of his unrequited devotion to his at once more and less fortunate brother is sufficiently affecting. But the most charming thing in these pages is the history of the theatre of marionettes—in plain English, the puppet-show—which has been for many years a brilliant feature of the author's home at Nohant. Madame Sand has written few more delightful pages. There are puppet-shows and puppet-shows; Madame Sand takes the institution very seriously and earnestly pleads the cause of *fantoccini* as a domestic amusement. The account she gives of the gradual elaboration and finally brilliant perfection of the troupe of marionettes of which her son had constituted himself operator is peculiarly interesting, and all that she says about the possible extension of the development of the entertainment is full of a characteristic appreciation, both of artistic and human things. We recommend the perusal of these pages, and we urge their being acted upon. Or must we be French and frivolous to care about ingenious and artistic pastimes? We should almost recommend that the article be translated, and circulated as a tract, for the benefit of domestic circles infected with what Matthew Arnold calls "dreariness."

A Descriptive Catalogue of Playing and Other Cards in the British Museum; accompanied by a concise general history of the subject, and remarks on cards of divination and of a politico-historical character. By William Hughes Willshire, M.D. Edin. (Printed by order of the Trustees. 1876. Pp. vi.-360. The Same. Supplement with illustrations. 1877. Pp. vi.-88.)—This full title fairly indicates the scope of the book before us. Dr. Willshire has given us an abundance of valuable matter in a manner provokingly disjointed. The main part was printed before the supplement was projected; it contained descriptions of the 255 packs, or parts of packs, then in the Museum. The second part describes 42 numbers added to the Museum collection since the printing of the main catalogue, and also supplies twenty-four full-page plates, some of which are colored by hand, and most of which are produced by the process of photogravure of MM. Goupil & Cie.—a process especially suited for work of this kind, as it brings out not only the lines of the design but the quality and tint of the original paper, and differentiates—if we may venture the word—the character of the original engravings. In these plates are figured forty or more of the most interesting specimens of the Museum collection—beginning, of course, with the Carte di Baldini, or so-called Mantegna cards, in regard to which, and their connection with a set of Albert Dürer's designs, reference may be had to Prof. Colvin's recent articles in the *Portfolio*. The subjects of the plates seem hardly as well chosen as those which accompanied M. R. Merlin's quarto volume on the 'Origine des Cartes à Jouer,' published in Paris in 1399.

M. Merlin (auspicious name!) was the first to cast a ray of white light on the origin of playing-cards, and Dr. Willshire quotes from him copiously and frequently, and is disposed to accept his conclusions.

The old idea that they were invented by a certain Pierre Gringonneur to amuse the sick King Charles VI. of France, is now exploded. Dr. Willshire does not even take the trouble to lay the ghost again. Cards seem to have appeared suddenly and almost simultaneously in Europe and in Asia. Were they invented in Asia, passing thence at once into Europe, or *vice versa*, or were the inventions in the two continents independent? An absolute answer is impossible, but M. Merlin's investigations make it most probable that the invention in Europe was at least independent. In Europe and America numeral cards are now in universal use, save among the lower classes in a few of the Latin nations, who cling to the *tarots* pack, from which the numeral cards are derived. *Tarots* in turn, if we follow M. Merlin (and we can see no reason for not doing so), had their origin in a modification of the Mantegna or Baldini sequence, of Venetian or Florentine birth. Anterior to these again was a series of designs executed by hand in Italy, possibly, nay, probably, for childish amusement and known as *naïbis*. Whether these owed anything to the East or not it is impossible now to say. M. Merlin thinks not; he sees in the series of *naïbis* a revelation of the Catholic thought and Italian ideas of the epoch, and believes that to seek further is needless. Positive evidence is wanting, and in default of this the chain of evidence breaks at the Italian origin of playing-cards. The collection of cards here catalogued is not as ample as it was to be expected that the British Museum would possess: although there are nearly 300 numbers, many interesting packs are absent. Dr. Willshire records no silver pack, though they are not very rare: M. Merlin had one, of which he gave illustrations in his book; and a fine and full set of fifty-two, engraved at Augsburg toward the end of the seventeenth century and belonging to Mr. M. T. Tueski, was to be seen at South Kensington in 1873. In many of the minor modern cards, fanciful variations of the regulation suits and sets, the Museum collection is deficient. There is, for instance, a pack (E. 206) of the second quarter of the last century, published in London, on each card of which there is a stanza of song with the stave of musical accompaniment; but we do not find in the catalogue the more curious pack of this century, each card of which contains four bars of music, so that by the arrangement and rearrangement of the cards an almost endless variety of waltzes and polkas may be composed. In historical English cards (E. 185 *et seq.*) relating to the Spanish Armada, the Popish plot, the Rye-House plot, James II., Marlborough, the Rump Parliament, etc., the collection is far richer. In the artistically interesting packs which bear upon the early history of wood-engraving, closely connected at its birth with the genesis of playing-cards, the collection of the Museum is fairly full. How close the connection was is still in doubt; although to this day playing-cards are sometimes stencilled and lithographed, it was only the almost contemporaneous invention of printing from the block which made their popularity possible. Dr. Willshire's familiarity with the styles of early engravers has stood him in good stead in deciding more than one vexed question, and his acquaintance with early prints has been made of use in frequent reference to the first pictorial representations of games at cards. The furniture of the book—index, table of contents, etc.—is excellent.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Price.
Avery (B. P.), <i>Californian Pictures in Prose and Verse</i>	(Hurd & Houghton) \$5 50
Baby Ballads.....	(Lee & Shepard) 1 00
Bryce (Prof. J.), <i>Transcaucasia and Ararat</i>	(Macmillan & Co.) 2 50
Calvert (G. H.), <i>Charlotte von Stein</i>	(Lee & Shepard) 1 50
De Vere (G. A.), <i>Antar and Zara: Poems</i>	(Lee & Shepard) 1 50
Dolbear (Prof. A. E.), <i>The Telephone</i>	(Heny S. King & Co.) 75
Farquharson (Martha), <i>Elsie's Children</i>	(Dodd, Mead & Co.) 1 50
Fetherstonehaugh (Hon. Mrs.), <i>Lil: a Tale</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 00
Fisher (Prof. G. P.), <i>Beginnings of Christianity</i>	(Scribner, Armstrong & Co.) 3 00
Hackländer (F. W.), <i>Forbidden Fruit: a Tale</i>	(Estes & Lauriat) 1 50
Hall (Capt. C. W.), <i>Adrift in the Ice-fields</i>	(Lee & Shepard) 1 50
Jevons (Prof. W. S.), <i>Principles of Science</i> , 2d ed.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 4 00
Packard (A. S., Jr.), <i>Our Common Insects</i>	(Estes & Lauriat) 1 50
Nystrom (J. W.), <i>Steam Engineering</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 2 50
Payson (E.), <i>Doctor Tom: a Tale</i>	(Dresser, McLellan & Co.)
Pennell (H. C.), <i>Pegasus Re-saddled: Poetry</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 2 50
Poetical Works of Coleridge and Keats, 2 vols.....	(Hurd & Houghton)
Robinson (Leora B.), <i>Patsy: a Story for Girls</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 25
Roe (Rev. E. P.), <i>A Knight of the Nineteenth Century</i>	(Dodd, Mead & Co.) 1 50
Sand (Mme.), <i>Tower of Percefont</i>	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Seiss (Rev. J. A.), <i>A Miracle in Stone</i>	(Porter & Coates) 1 25
Sturtevant (Prof. J. M.), <i>Economics or, The Science of Wealth</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 75
Taylor (R. W.), <i>Xenophon's Anabasis of Cyrus, Books III., IV.</i>	(divilegtons)
Thompson (Prof. E. E.), <i>Hard Times and What to Learn from Them</i> , swd.....	(Edward Stern & Co.) 15
Thornbury (W.), <i>Life of J. M. W. Turner, R.A.</i>	(Henry Holt & Co.)
Van Laun (H.), <i>History of French Literature, Vol. III.</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 2 50
Walford (L. B.), <i>Pauline: a Tale</i>	(Henry Holt & Co.) 1 00
Warren (Prof. E.), <i>Elements of Descriptive Geometry</i>	(John Wiley & Sons) 3 50
Warner (Susan), <i>Diana</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 25
Wheaton (C.), <i>Six Sinners: Set ool Days in Bantam Valley</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 75
Worcester's New Primary Spelling-book.....	(Wm. Ware & Co.)

